

WASHINGTON

Charles R. Bockmier to be postmaster at Granite Falls, Wash., in place of C. R. Bockmier. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

Maud E. Hays to be postmaster at Starbuck, Wash., in place of M. E. Hays. Incumbent's commission expires February 12, 1931.

Arthur A. Bousquet to be postmaster at Wenatchee, Wash., in place of A. A. Bousquet. Incumbent's commission expires February 16, 1931.

WEST VIRGINIA

John B. Hilleary to be postmaster at Buckhannon, W. Va., in place of J. B. Hilleary. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

William M. Kidd to be postmaster at Burnsville, W. Va., in place of W. M. Kidd. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

Carl A. Dehner to be postmaster at Chester, W. Va., in place of C. A. Dehner. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

Walter O. Deacon to be postmaster at Hurricane, W. Va., in place of W. O. Deacon. Incumbent's commission expires February 14, 1931.

Oliver A. Locke to be postmaster at Milton, W. Va., in place of O. A. Locke. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

WISCONSIN

Herman Rau to be postmaster at Chilton, Wis., in place of J. H. Wagner, removed.

Frederick N. Lochemes to be postmaster at St. Francis, Wis., in place of F. N. Lochemes. Incumbent's commission expires February 11, 1931.

Wilbur H. Bridgman to be postmaster at Stanley, Wis., in place of W. H. Bridgman. Incumbent's commission expires February 17, 1931.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, FEBRUARY 3, 1931

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Thou art the one and profound remedy for human weakness and human sin. As a loving Father, Thou standest at the door of every heart and, with Thy fullness, art ready to enter. How we thank Thee for the greatness and the permanence of that love with which Thou hast loved us. Accept our deepest gratitude and continue with us in our great needs and ballast our very souls with wisdom and patience. Rekindle in us those mighty enthusiasms which shall make these days great and equip us as the strong sons of God. Thou hast two thrones—one in the highest heavens and one in the lowliest heart. All that Thou requirest of us is a beautiful and a humble life that deals justly, loves mercy, and walks with God in the chosen path of our high calling. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Mr. Craven, its principal clerk, announced that the Senate had passed, without amendment, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 14040. An act to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to expedite work on the Federal building program authorized by the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926, and acts amendatory thereof.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments in which the concurrence of the House is requested, a bill of the House of the following title:

H. R. 10166. An act to authorize the Secretary of the Navy to proceed with the construction of certain public works at Philadelphia, Pa., and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House to a concurrent resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. Con. Res. 37. Concurrent resolution to provide for the printing of additional copies of House Document No. 722, Seventy-first Congress, being a message from the President of the United States transmitting a report on the enforcement of the prohibition laws of the United States.

PETER R. WADSWORTH

Mr. IRWIN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Claims I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill (H. R. 6668) for the relief of Peter R. Wadsworth, with Senate amendments thereto, and concur in the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill and the Senate amendments.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the Senate amendments, as follows:

Strike out all after the enacting clause and in lieu thereof insert the following:

"That there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$1,012.32, to be credited to the tribal funds of the Chippewa Indians, for the purpose of discharging the obligations of Peter R. Wadsworth, former superintendent and special disbursing agent of the Consolidated Chippewa Indian Agency, Cass Lake, Minn., arising out of the failure of the First National Bank of St. Cloud, Minn., on June 17, 1925.

"SEC. 2. The Secretary of the Interior is authorized and directed to pay, out of the money so credited, the unpaid claims of all Chippewa Indians against such agency arising out of such bank failure."

Amend the title so as to read: "An act to provide for discharging certain obligations of Peter R. Wadsworth, former superintendent and special disbursing agent of the Consolidated Chippewa Indian Agency."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, in what particular does this change the House bill?

Mr. IRWIN. It is merely a matter of changing the language in the bill.

Mr. GARNER. Does it go any further than to appropriate a thousand dollars and odd?

Mr. IRWIN. It does not change the amount, \$1,012.32.

Mr. GARNER. What is the additional language? Does it authorize any future appropriation?

Mr. IRWIN. No; it simply changed the language to put it in a more parliamentary form.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Senate amendments were agreed to.

WAYS AND MEANS COMMITTEE—LEAVE TO SIT DURING SESSIONS OF HOUSE

Mr. HAWLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Ways and Means be authorized to sit during the sessions of the House for one week.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, is there any chance of getting any soldiers' legislation to pay now the adjusted-compensation certificates out of that committee?

Mr. HAWLEY. The committee is working very hard upon it, assembling the information. What the committee will do I am not authorized to state.

Mr. BLANTON. The ex-service men are appealing to the Members of the House from every State and district in the Union. They want to know what to expect, and we want to have some definite information to give them.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

PENSIONS

Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 16744) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain

soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, and ask that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill and that it may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following bills referred to the committee:

- | | | |
|-----------------------------------|------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| H. R. 1617. Charity V. Waitman | H. R. 13754. Emma A. Boisseau. | H. R. 15236. Ella Andrews. |
| H. R. 3526. Sarah A. Colwell. | H. R. 13764. Gertrude Newton. | H. R. 15237. Elizabeth Kridler. |
| H. R. 3835. Gertrude K. Miller. | H. R. 13776. Sarah S. Ginn. | H. R. 15249. Ella Grove. |
| H. R. 7433. Anna Walker. | H. R. 13793. Nancy Napier. | H. R. 15301. Catherine Durling. |
| H. R. 7810. Emma C. Wright. | H. R. 13798. Sarah A. Clements. | H. R. 15302. Serena E. Robinson. |
| H. R. 8795. Porter H. Rogers. | H. R. 13800. Jennie E. Baetcke. | H. R. 15303. Mary J. McKee. |
| H. R. 9093. Lillah J. Davis. | H. R. 13823. Mary E. Brooks. | H. R. 15312. Anna Beckert. |
| H. R. 9320. Mahala Turner. | H. R. 13834. Christiana Kline. | H. R. 15314. Ora M. White. |
| H. R. 9520. Nanna Hooper. | H. R. 13836. Susan Keperling. | H. R. 15321. Sarah F. Lindley. |
| H. R. 9746. Catherine B. Strong | H. R. 13848. Mary M. Miller. | H. R. 15325. Susan E. Luckey. |
| H. R. 10619. Agnes Maydwell. | H. R. 13859. Julia M. Huff. | H. R. 15326. Samantha V. Lowe. |
| H. R. 11567. Olive H. Woods. | H. R. 13869. Louvenia F. Barger. | H. R. 15329. Alice Ferrin. |
| H. R. 12675. Annie E. Moorman. | H. R. 13871. Nancy J. Herring. | H. R. 15332. Sadie A. Coburn. |
| H. R. 13219. Martha J. Blanchard. | H. R. 13886. Martha J. Phillips. | H. R. 15338. Agnes S. Craig. |
| H. R. 13324. Hattie F. Clark. | H. R. 13888. Martha C. Parman. | H. R. 15381. Minnie Hedrick. |
| H. R. 13346. Selma Ward. | H. R. 13890. Joseph P. Ligon. | H. R. 15382. Cora D. Willett. |
| H. R. 13353. Sarah Conkel. | H. R. 13894. Zachariah T. Olbin, | H. R. 15388. Lovina Yarian. |
| H. R. 13355. Emily Coy. | alias Zachariah | H. R. 15389. Lena Van Anda. |
| H. R. 13356. Mary Dawson. | Olbin, alias Zach- | H. R. 15390. Lucy J. Shore. |
| H. R. 13357. Elizabeth Freshcorn. | ariah Olbin. | H. R. 15391. Catharine Stanford. |
| H. R. 13358. Nancy O. Hurt. | H. R. 13897. Mary E. Hoffman. | H. R. 15394. Sarah A. Thompson. |
| H. R. 13359. Mary J. Hunt. | H. R. 13898. Elizabeth Pansler. | H. R. 15401. Lucinda Shelton. |
| H. R. 13362. Addie McKee. | H. R. 13899. Martha J. Johnson. | H. R. 15403. Annie Killion. |
| H. R. 13364. Samantha Rucker. | H. R. 13905. Margaret Vaughn. | H. R. 15405. Mary Cardiff. |
| H. R. 13365. Mary E. Turner. | H. R. 13906. Molley Simmons. | H. R. 15407. Lulu H. Powers. |
| H. R. 13369. Theodore L. Wilson. | H. R. 13913. Louisa L. Fryman. | H. R. 15413. Sarah Weedon. |
| H. R. 13370. Bessie Carr. | H. R. 13927. Percy Renick. | H. R. 15414. Ann E. McKissick. |
| H. R. 13390. Laura E. Whitaker. | H. R. 13942. Olivia Harris. | H. R. 15438. Martha A. Peer. |
| H. R. 13392. Elizabeth Nixdorf. | H. R. 13945. Mary Clegg. | H. R. 15439. Emily S. Cravens. |
| H. R. 13394. Kate Merritts. | H. R. 13947. Susannah B. Simp- | H. R. 15442. Barbaretta Weekly. |
| H. R. 13401. Rachel Davis. | son. | H. R. 15459. Malinda Young. |
| H. R. 13409. Mary A. Crum. | H. R. 13950. Margaret McCoy. | H. R. 15468. Roxanna Jane |
| H. R. 13410. Harriet McDaniel | H. R. 13951. Agnes Sink. | Turner. |
| Cornell. | H. R. 13952. Catherine E. Wolf- | H. R. 16469. Amanda E. Larick. |
| H. R. 13412. Harriet W. Eador. | gong. | H. R. 16470. Jennie A. Wildy. |
| H. R. 13413. Joanna Jemima | H. R. 13963. Mary R. Butler. | H. R. 16471. Mary Schmidt. |
| Herron. | H. R. 13965. Oma D. Morgan. | H. R. 16477. Ella Sullivan. |
| H. R. 13419. Margaret A. Wells. | H. R. 13974. Margaret A. Belvel. | H. R. 15484. Margaret Plerson. |
| H. R. 13424. Emma Knott. | H. R. 13978. Genettie D. Harlan. | H. R. 15504. Maria Langhans. |
| H. R. 13431. McHenry Whitney. | H. R. 13980. America J. McCoun. | H. R. 15509. Emma Robinson. |
| H. R. 13452. Annie Hanes. | H. R. 13982. Catherine Johnson. | H. R. 15521. Clara G. Branch. |
| H. R. 13462. Amy J. Ray. | H. R. 13989. Patience Metcalf. | H. R. 15528. Mary Meier. |
| H. R. 13463. Amanda E. Walter. | H. R. 13992. Eliza J. Spohn. | H. R. 15530. Mary M. Hawkins. |
| H. R. 13467. Elizabeth E. Fickle. | H. R. 14011. Fanny Conner. | H. R. 15536. Sarah J. Weaver. |
| H. R. 13469. Louise B. Ogle. | H. R. 14014. Martha P. Hoffer. | H. R. 15537. Mary E. Bigley. |
| H. R. 13477. Rebecca Bonnell. | H. R. 14015. Alice Loughner. | H. R. 15542. Euphemia S. Coon. |
| H. R. 13486. Emma M. Shattuck. | H. R. 14016. Susan Marshall. | H. R. 15545. Sabina Tacey. |
| H. R. 13488. Cornelia E. M. Mc- | H. R. 14020. Susan Mitchell. | H. R. 15546. Jennie Marshall. |
| Ginnis. | H. R. 14025. Clara Ziegler. | H. R. 15557. Harriet A. Weeks. |
| H. R. 13499. Mary J. Miller. | H. R. 14101. William J. Coberly, | H. R. 15558. Sibyl A. Rowell. |
| H. R. 13503. Rhoda T. Dawson. | alias William Co- | H. R. 15574. Mary Jacobson. |
| H. R. 13504. Ruth H. Davis. | berly, alias Wil- | H. R. 15581. Elizabeth Sutton. |
| H. R. 13505. Tamzen B. Lippin- | liam Coberly. | H. R. 15625. Adda Laura Morri- |
| cott. | H. R. 14112. Mattie T. Gray. | son. |
| H. R. 13506. Mary E. Purnell. | H. R. 14145. Mary O. Miller. | H. R. 15633. Meta Tellkamp. |
| H. R. 13510. Helen Winton. | H. R. 14187. John Aldridge, alias | H. R. 15645. Melissa A. Moore. |
| H. R. 13512. Martha J. Graham. | John N. Aldridge. | H. R. 15681. Mollie Bouldin. |
| H. R. 13607. Hettie M. Davis. | H. R. 14198. Mary J. Hull. | H. R. 15703. Sarah Jones. |
| H. R. 13626. Hattie N. Peckham. | H. R. 14200. Ellah M. Cole. | H. R. 15704. Louisa Manterstock. |
| H. R. 13634. Laura Reen. | H. R. 14215. Hester L. Penrose. | H. R. 15788. Catherine Ruther- |
| H. R. 13635. Mary E. Knisley. | H. R. 14226. Charles Bell. | ford. |
| H. R. 13639. Rebecca J. Walker. | H. R. 14237. Henrietta Ray. | H. R. 15793. Almeda Leal. |
| H. R. 13642. S. Emeline Dewey. | H. R. 14305. Hattie A. Lemen. | H. R. 15802. Winnie A. Strayer. |
| H. R. 13655. Mary Frey. | H. R. 14329. Eliza I. Utter. | H. R. 15811. Martha Pack. |
| H. R. 13656. Mary A. Starry. | H. R. 14335. Mary J. Beckwith. | H. R. 15843. Sarah A. McDole. |
| H. R. 13657. Elizabeth Luty. | H. R. 14338. Eliza Martin. | H. R. 15882. Elizabeth F. Welch. |
| H. R. 13718. Sarah Delph. | H. R. 14353. Hattie M. Robbins. | H. R. 15909. Sarah E. Phillips. |
| H. R. 13719. Elizabeth Hargis. | H. R. 14357. Rachel E. Smith. | H. R. 15912. Joseph Morton Fin- |
| H. R. 13720. Mary P. Cummins. | H. R. 14365. Susan Ashley. | ney. |
| H. R. 13724. Kiziah Knowles. | H. R. 14366. Lizzie Downing. | H. R. 15920. Eleveann Albert. |
| H. R. 13725. Laura E. Hill. | H. R. 14374. Martha R. Brown. | H. R. 15935. Louisa C. Morehead. |
| H. R. 13726. Richard M. Williams. | H. R. 14375. Annie E. Tillinghast. | H. R. 15936. Emma C. Butler. |
| H. R. 13728. Eliza G. McWhorter. | H. R. 14381. Jennie Morrison. | H. R. 15978. Dora E. Hutchens. |
| H. R. 13730. Elizabeth Baker. | H. R. 14384. Mary E. Britton. | H. R. 16001. Mary E. Shirk. |
| H. R. 14427. Sarah C. Personett. | H. R. 14621. Mary E. Campbell. | H. R. 16002. Minnie G. Oakley. |
| H. R. 14431. Ella B. White. | H. R. 14622. Louisa V. Osbon. | H. R. 16016. Mary F. Becknell. |
| H. R. 14432. Mary A. Bowman. | H. R. 14625. Mary S. Greenamire. | H. R. 16018. Adelia H. Bishop. |
| H. R. 14434. Phebe Janet Clark. | H. R. 14633. Margaret E. Seydell. | H. R. 16020. Frederick C. Perry. |
| H. R. 14461. Augusta H. Briggs. | H. R. 14640. Lydia Bacon. | H. R. 16046. Sarah J. Libby. |
| H. R. 14469. Catharine Berry. | H. R. 14642. Elizabeth Wilson. | H. R. 16055. Louisa H. Emerson. |
| H. R. 14485. Alice Werner. | H. R. 14647. Emma J. Finkle. | H. R. 16106. Nellie N. Taft. |
| H. R. 14494. Ann Amelia Moore. | H. R. 14662. Mary A. Work. | H. R. 16121. Margaret S. Whirl. |
| H. R. 14495. Catherine Jones. | H. R. 14665. Hildia P. Hiatt. | H. R. 16134. Jane Alden. |
| H. R. 14521. Mary F. Stewart. | H. R. 14668. Nancy Wood. | H. R. 16142. Margaret A. Webster |
| H. R. 14523. Emma R. McDaniels. | H. R. 14670. Clementine Blewald. | H. R. 16146. Frances M. Paul. |
| H. R. 14594. Hannah M. Hamil- | H. R. 14736. Mary F. Shook. | H. R. 16175. Elizabeth Young. |
| ton. | H. R. 14741. Mary Carpenter. | H. R. 16224. Martha Hattery. |
| H. R. 14621. Mary E. Campbell. | H. R. 14746. Rebecca E. Smith. | H. R. 16233. Anna Gault. |
| H. R. 14622. Louisa V. Osbon. | H. R. 14747. Caroline Light. | H. R. 16311. Sallie Brown. |
| H. R. 14625. Mary S. Greenamire. | H. R. 14748. Mary Burke. | H. R. 16318. Margaret E. Maxwell. |
| H. R. 14633. Margaret E. Seydell. | H. R. 14753. Luiticia A. Widener. | H. R. 16326. Alfaretta S. Bond. |
| H. R. 14640. Lydia Bacon. | H. R. 14758. Ellen Welch. | H. R. 16350. Jennie C. Wakefield. |
| H. R. 14642. Elizabeth Wilson. | H. R. 14760. Gennari Francis. | H. R. 16367. Cora B. Sollers. |
| H. R. 14647. Emma J. Finkle. | H. R. 14764. Permella J. Bratton. | H. R. 16391. Susan E. Allen. |
| H. R. 14662. Mary A. Work. | H. R. 14769. Fendora M. Terwilli- | H. R. 16582. Frances Adelia Hun- |
| H. R. 14665. Hildia P. Hiatt. | ger. | gerford. |
| H. R. 14668. Nancy Wood. | H. R. 14776. Laura Oram. | H. R. 16611. Virginia Hamilton. |
| H. R. 14670. Clementine Blewald. | H. R. 14778. Margaret Sherman. | |
| H. R. 14736. Mary F. Shook. | H. R. 14781. Jennie A. Smith. | |
| H. R. 14741. Mary Carpenter. | H. R. 14783. Ida Jacobs. | |
| H. R. 14746. Rebecca E. Smith. | H. R. 14784. Catherine A. Bailey. | |
| H. R. 14747. Caroline Light. | H. R. 14787. Sadie M. Corell. | |
| H. R. 14748. Mary Burke. | H. R. 14789. Adalaid Collins. | |
| H. R. 14753. Luiticia A. Widener. | H. R. 14790. Harriet Austin. | |
| H. R. 14758. Ellen Welch. | H. R. 14791. Myrtle L. McDerm- | |
| H. R. 14760. Gennari Francis. | mott. | |
| H. R. 14764. Permella J. Bratton. | H. R. 14796. Miranda Q. Moore. | |
| H. R. 14769. Fendora M. Terwilli- | H. R. 14851. Julian E. Cooper. | |
| ger. | H. R. 14852. Ellen J. Ludlow. | |
| H. R. 14776. Laura Oram. | H. R. 14855. Sarah F. Downard. | |
| H. R. 14778. Margaret Sherman. | H. R. 14869. Jennie A. Whitney. | |
| H. R. 14781. Jennie A. Smith. | H. R. 14880. Sarah E. Dyer. | |
| H. R. 14783. Ida Jacobs. | H. R. 14903. Emma Gordon. | |
| H. R. 14784. Catherine A. Bailey. | H. R. 14946. Adaline Roberts. | |
| H. R. 14787. Sadie M. Corell. | H. R. 14956. Anna S. Duffner. | |
| H. R. 14789. Adalaid Collins. | H. R. 14958. Isabelle Williams. | |
| H. R. 14790. Harriet Austin. | H. R. 14961. Allie E. Fleming. | |
| H. R. 14791. Myrtle L. McDerm- | H. R. 14962. Sara P. Bowen. | |
| mott. | H. R. 14965. Elizabeth Mitchell. | |
| H. R. 14796. Miranda Q. Moore. | H. R. 14968. Anneliza Drake. | |
| H. R. 14851. Julian E. Cooper. | H. R. 14973. Hannah L. Biller. | |
| H. R. 14852. Ellen J. Ludlow. | H. R. 14977. C. Victoria North- | |
| H. R. 14855. Sarah F. Downard. | rup. | |
| H. R. 14869. Jennie A. Whitney. | H. R. 14978. Mary Lamphere. | |
| H. R. 14880. Sarah E. Dyer. | H. R. 14985. Louisa M. Tuttle. | |
| H. R. 14903. Emma Gordon. | H. R. 15022. Anna S. Joseph. | |
| H. R. 14946. Adaline Roberts. | H. R. 15028. Alice Mobley. | |
| H. R. 14956. Anna S. Duffner. | H. R. 15034. Jerome Deniston. | |
| H. R. 14958. Isabelle Williams. | H. R. 15041. Sarah E. Sabie. | |
| H. R. 14961. Allie E. Fleming. | H. R. 15045. Maria L. McDonald. | |
| H. R. 14962. Sara P. Bowen. | H. R. 15052. Jane E. Richardson. | |
| H. R. 14965. Elizabeth Mitchell. | H. R. 15053. Ella S. Pattison. | |
| H. R. 14968. Anneliza Drake. | H. R. 15081. Amelia Zimmerman. | |
| H. R. 14973. Hannah L. Biller. | H. R. 15089. Lydia M. Gilbert. | |
| H. R. 14977. C. Victoria North- | H. R. 15090. Bettie M. Poe. | |
| rup. | H. R. 15091. Lizzie C. Fussell. | |
| H. R. 14978. Mary Lamphere. | H. R. 15094. Margaret A. Curtis. | |
| H. R. 14985. Louisa M. Tuttle. | H. R. 15095. Amelia J. Prince. | |
| H. R. 15022. Anna S. Joseph. | H. R. 15104. Rachel E. Lukenbill. | |
| H. R. 15028. Alice Mobley. | H. R. 15111. Sarah A. Charles. | |
| H. R. 15034. Jerome Deniston. | H. R. 15123. Julia Hollowell. | |
| H. R. 15041. Sarah E. Sabie. | H. R. 15124. Anna P. Smith. | |
| H. R. 15045. Maria L. McDonald. | H. R. 15154. Minnie Beach. | |
| H. R. 15052. Jane E. Richardson. | H. R. 15168. Mary J. Green. | |
| H. R. 15053. Ella S. Pattison. | H. R. 15170. Benjamin R. Middle- | |
| H. R. 15081. Amelia Zimmerman. | ton. | |
| H. R. 15089. Lydia M. Gilbert. | H. R. 15171. Minnie Palen. | |
| H. R. 15090. Bettie M. Poe. | H. R. 15180. Nancy E. Trueblood. | |
| H. R. 15091. Lizzie C. Fussell. | H. R. 15185. Elizabeth Heath. | |
| H. R. 15094. Margaret A. Curtis. | H. R. 15186. Elizabeth A. Frets. | |
| H. R. 15095. Amelia J. Prince. | H. R. 15189. Hannah J. Donnell. | |
| H. R. 15104. Rachel E. Lukenbill. | H. R. 15190. Flora Myers. | |
| H. R. 15111. Sarah A. Charles. | H. R. 15195. Mary Hysle. | |
| H. R. 15123. Julia Hollowell. | H. R. 15196. Levorah Hawkins. | |
| H. R. 15124. Anna P. Smith. | H. R. 15203. Eliza R. Shockley. | |
| H. R. 15154. Minnie Beach. | H. R. 15209. Mary J. Siegfried. | |
| H. R. 15168. Mary J. Green. | H. R. 15211. Elnora L. Monroe. | |
| H. R. 15170. Benjamin R. Middle- | H. R. 15212. Mary J. Holden. | |

Mr. KOPP. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 16626) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, and so forth, and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors, and ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 16628, and that the same be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The foregoing bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the committee:

H. R. 1627. Emma W. Rice.	H. R. 8492. Roy L. Colvin.
H. R. 1976. Edward Lee.	H. R. 8518. Marigo J. Dafniotou.
H. R. 2221. William Gilpin.	H. R. 8587. Harvey B. Branstetter.
H. R. 2228. Bessie Hagar.	H. R. 8629. Elizabeth Housmann.
H. R. 2258. John Lorensen.	H. R. 8820. Waldo O. McCollum.
H. R. 2263. Dallas R. McClintock.	H. R. 8833. John W. Cole.
H. R. 2551. Warren J. Coleman.	H. R. 8900. George M. Harter.
H. R. 3049. Gabriel Bolter.	H. R. 9165. Maggie E. Freeland.
H. R. 3160. Mabel M. Callahan.	H. R. 9214. Samuel Gwartney.
H. R. 3432. Mary E. Taylor.	H. R. 9275. William F. Sheean.
H. R. 3649. Nancy Ann Whitehead.	H. R. 9366. Mary Murphy.
H. R. 3878. Essie Hortobben.	H. R. 9461. William T. Moore.
H. R. 4036. Henry Meyers.	H. R. 9469. Thomas Yeager.
H. R. 4259. Andrew A. Menne.	H. R. 9470. John W. Hudson.
H. R. 4383. Catherine E. Cowhick.	H. R. 9544. Samuel Curry.
H. R. 4640. Olive B. Beall.	H. R. 9643. Alice E. Turner.
H. R. 4762. Neil Douglas Bromley.	H. R. 9662. William P. Myers.
H. R. 4770. Frank Miller.	H. R. 9813. Ada V. Awbrey.
H. R. 4828. Daisy Pelfrey.	H. R. 9882. Marie A. Abernathy.
H. R. 4837. Nannie Grubb.	H. R. 9945. Solomon Nally.
H. R. 4943. Mae A. De Barrows.	H. R. 10001. George H. Walker.
H. R. 4995. Seth J. Cleveland.	H. R. 10088. Henry T. Roddy.
H. R. 5014. Benjamin Coleman Read.	H. R. 10090. Rhoda A. Woods.
H. R. 5143. Sarah Holtsclaw.	H. R. 10096. Cordella C. Moore.
H. R. 5175. Ida W. Anchors.	H. R. 10116. David R. Majors.
H. R. 5240. William E. Murrah.	H. R. 10135. Morgan Cherry.
H. R. 5291. Roy Raymond Keeley.	H. R. 10247. Beverly A. Foster.
H. R. 5335. Anna Luch.	H. R. 10283. Katherine McDonald.
H. R. 5535. Jonathan Craig, alias Rolin Story.	H. R. 10349. Henry B. Gaylor.
H. R. 5555. Alexander Monroe.	H. R. 10350. Robert L. Aycock.
H. R. 5848. Thomas J. Harris.	H. R. 10367. Charles M. Smith.
H. R. 5958. Richard H. Gedda.	H. R. 10405. Peter G. Petersen.
H. R. 5963. James N. Stribling.	H. R. 10408. Wiley N. Johnston.
H. R. 6026. J. L. Baxter.	H. R. 10507. Carrie R. Pine.
H. R. 6067. Harry J. Bunton.	H. R. 10538. Romeo S. Montminy.
H. R. 6239. William J. Cobble.	H. R. 10551. William Henry Gray.
H. R. 6249. Constantine Witcofsky.	H. R. 10601. William Hargis.
H. R. 6434. James A. Nickell.	H. R. 10699. Melie M. Anderson.
H. R. 6521. William G. Jones.	H. R. 10702. Rufus M. Barnes.
H. R. 6753. Nellie Murray.	H. R. 10755. Rachel Bledsoe.
H. R. 7082. Paul C. Stoval.	H. R. 10848. Matilda Hunt.
H. R. 7110. John O. Collings.	H. R. 10861. Thomas E. Carson.
H. R. 7166. Hugh B. Mitchell.	H. R. 10867. Amanda M. Bailey.
H. R. 7169. Elvra O. Swearingen.	H. R. 10873. Addie Young.
H. R. 7217. James B. Taylor.	H. R. 10902. Fred E. Kunkel.
H. R. 7350. Charles S. Cooper.	H. R. 10927. Elizabeth M. Olson.
H. R. 7532. Sallie Gray Fowler.	H. R. 11002. Winifred B. Hodges.
H. R. 7689. Daniel O. Underwood.	H. R. 11016. John Flanagan.
H. R. 7737. Honorah Downey.	H. R. 11023. Amanda E. Wade.
H. R. 7771. William L. Sheldon.	H. R. 11064. Martha Eberlein.
H. R. 7834. Anna C. Tobias.	H. R. 11111. Loisa Blasis.
H. R. 7839. Emma E. Ferneding.	H. R. 11117. Lottie T. Miller.
H. R. 8026. Obeline Roy Martel.	H. R. 11209. Eunice C. McGarvey.
H. R. 8030. Thomas E. Cruess.	H. R. 11260. Wayne Ripatte.
H. R. 8074. Edward Everett Harding.	H. R. 11264. Ella Gill.
H. R. 8226. May Mandeville.	H. R. 11314. Alida T. Bruce.
H. R. 8254. Pearl Spangler.	H. R. 11462. Marian Redfield Healey.
H. R. 8274. Florence M. Fichtl.	H. R. 11539. Martha E. Sickel.
H. R. 8320. Hannah Green.	H. R. 11555. Rachel E. Stewart.
H. R. 8379. Annie Dale Lods.	H. R. 11612. Edwin H. McSloy.
H. R. 8411. Jacob J. Waltz.	H. R. 11643. Milton F. Morgan.
H. R. 8484. George L. Green.	H. R. 11658. John F. Graper.
	H. R. 11681. Mary V. Thorne.
	H. R. 11800. Charles M. Porter.
	H. R. 11832. Henry C. Potter.
	H. R. 11833. David Johnson.
	H. R. 11918. Elizabeth Ramsey.
	H. R. 11926. Lena Mann.

H. R. 11951. George E. Stevens.	H. R. 13902. Mary M. North.
H. R. 12016. Phillip Winckler.	H. R. 13910. Wiley M. Gott.
H. R. 12074. Mary T. Marks.	H. R. 13914. Augusta Schulte.
H. R. 12081. Jessie Murdock.	H. R. 13967. Ada Rominger.
H. R. 12089. George W. Musser.	H. R. 13968. William A. Helms.
H. R. 12120. James W. Hussey.	H. R. 13997. Mary A. Fradley.
H. R. 12124. Clara M. Schneider.	H. R. 14157. Josephine Wilson.
H. R. 12147. Alice Roberts.	H. R. 14159. Emma Von Minden.
H. R. 12182. Mary Buckley.	H. R. 14195. Ida Davis.
H. R. 12183. Calhoun Shearouse.	H. R. 14205. Nellie E. Hammer.
H. R. 12272. Roscoe C. Trusty.	H. R. 14207. Isabell A. Yandle.
H. R. 12281. August Bemmerer.	H. R. 14240. Albert W. Getchell.
H. R. 12292. Will Ralph Johnson.	H. R. 14351. Julia Mulkey.
H. R. 12372. John Miller.	H. R. 14371. Nettie Adams.
H. R. 12428. Bridget Keegan.	H. R. 14514. Jessie G. Bivens.
H. R. 12464. Albert F. Campbell.	H. R. 14528. Carl W. Jansson.
H. R. 12515. Zerah M. Bridges.	H. R. 14599. Fannie McClellan.
H. R. 12588. Judah Wormington.	H. R. 14661. James A. Hyden.
H. R. 12652. John D. Hoskins.	H. R. 14743. Mamie L. Eusebio.
H. R. 12688. Charles MacGregor.	H. R. 14770. Early G. Rodgers.
H. R. 12735. Nina Mehlberg.	H. R. 14774. Mary L. De Fabbio.
H. R. 12774. Grace O. Barmore.	H. R. 14777. Mary C. Rinderle.
H. R. 12784. Grace Fay Lobben.	H. R. 14848. Hannah Corbett.
H. R. 12786. Kemple Belanga.	H. R. 14871. Carrie Runner.
H. R. 12787. Ned Mitchell Harrison.	H. R. 14931. Harvey E. Rodgers.
H. R. 12813. Nelda S. Shearer.	H. R. 14988. David and Edith Stadtner.
H. R. 12817. George E. Manning.	H. R. 15059. Emma L. Zittel.
H. R. 12826. Ida Aviszus.	H. R. 15108. Martin E. Miller.
H. R. 12857. Miriam E. Hogue.	H. R. 15118. Maggie Gaddy.
H. R. 12863. Edith Stevens.	H. R. 15127. Ethel B. Sutherland.
H. R. 12932. John W. Griffin.	H. R. 15128. Edward Forte.
H. R. 12944. Alexander E. Brown.	H. R. 15177. Rosa Victoria Buck.
H. R. 13001. Mary E. Beggs.	H. R. 15201. Francis X. Mayer.
H. R. 13048. Rose M. Smith.	H. R. 15224. Marton O. Barnes.
H. R. 13071. Maryland Adams.	H. R. 15253. Lulu F. Hope.
H. R. 13232. Mary E. Anderson.	H. R. 15385. William Bell.
H. R. 13242. Foolish Bear.	H. R. 15445. Edna M. Garrity.
H. R. 13295. Mary M. Carr.	H. R. 15480. Emma Straub.
H. R. 13328. Elizabeth S. Parey.	H. R. 15544. Lucinda C. Abbott.
H. R. 13349. Richard E. Adams.	H. R. 15560. Mary L. Radel.
H. R. 13497. Bridget Gallagher.	H. R. 15714. Annie Williams.
H. R. 13667. Mary M. Walton.	H. R. 15721. Jane Carr Wood.
H. R. 13669. Dorsey Hickok.	H. R. 15818. Dora B. Karnes.
H. R. 13687. Sallie Miles.	H. R. 15914. Thomas L. Holcomb.
H. R. 13732. George Hammer.	H. R. 16032. Mabel Irene Patterson.
H. R. 13838. Ellis B. McNeeley.	H. R. 16060. Martin Hanson.
H. R. 13849. James F. Madden.	H. R. 16279. Grace A. Mael.
H. R. 13852. Olive R. Sanderlin.	
H. R. 13874. Ida L. Crandall.	

PROCEDURE IN THE HOUSE

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to propound a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. TREADWAY. On page 3746 and following pages of yesterday's CONGRESSIONAL RECORD appears the report of an address made in the other branch of Congress yesterday in which certain Members of this branch are called by name and certain questions asked them. In view of this fact, I ask whether it is within the parliamentary rights of the Members of this branch to reply and to call Members of the other branch by name?

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Massachusetts may be permitted to say anything about any Member of the other branch that he desires, and to say how he voted on the \$200,000 appropriation for Salem, Mass.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman from Massachusetts does not ask the gentleman from Arkansas as to how he shall proceed. I have submitted a parliamentary inquiry to the Speaker and that is all the privilege of the floor that I ask.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that whatever was said at the other end of the Capitol—

Mr. PARKS. Ought to have been said.

Mr. RANKIN. Was with reference to statements made by Members of this body on the outside. This identical question arose in this body a few years ago when the then Speaker of the House, Mr. GILLET, went, I believe, to New Haven, Conn., and made a speech attacking Members of the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will pardon the Chair for a moment; but upon what does he found the point of order? Upon a parliamentary inquiry?

Mr. RANKIN. As a matter of fact I make the point of order against the statement of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY]. He rises here and undertakes to discuss what was said in the Senate.

Mr. SNELL. I make the point of order that the gentleman from Mississippi is not in order in making a point of order against the parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts propounded a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. RANKIN. He first made a statement to the effect that Members of the other body had attacked Members of this body, leaving the impression that it was in their official capacity.

Mr. SNELL. I make the point of order that the gentleman from Mississippi is not in order.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman from Massachusetts has no right, under the rules of the House, to rise and make any statement about what Members of the other body said.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts has not made a statement. He has asked a question of the Chair, and the Chair is about to answer.

Mr. PARKS. I insist that the Chair be very liberal.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman is quite out of order.

The Chair is ready to answer the parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, may I cite a ruling to the Chair?

The SPEAKER. The Chair has recently made a decision about this matter and has certain views about it.

Of course, it is very difficult to answer the question in a word or two. The Chair thinks it is of such fundamental importance that he will ask the indulgence of the House to refer to and repeat some of the things he said in a ruling made comparatively recently upon this subject.

On May 6, 1930, the question arose as to whether Members of the House could comment upon any statement made in the Senate reflecting in any way upon the motives or conduct of a Member of the House. On a previous occasion the Vice President, overruling a number of decisions which the Chair then quoted, which he will not quote now, held the technical question being whether Jefferson's Manual governs the proceedings of the Senate in this regard or in any other regard—

The Senate has not adopted Jefferson's Manual as a part of the rules of the Senate. It is left to the discretion of Senators as to what they may or may not say about the proceedings of the House in connection with the resolution under consideration.

Of course, that decision entirely nullifies Jefferson's Manual, there being no rules in either House specifically on this question.

With regard to the entire question of dealings between the House and Senate, and preserving some sort of sportsmanship and comity, the present occupant of the chair referred then and will refer again to two of the rules in Jefferson's Manual which govern this case if the rules apply.

In section 301:

It is highly expedient, says Hatsel, for the due preservation of the privileges of the separate branches of the legislature that neither should encroach on the other, or interfere in any manner depending before them, so as to preclude, or even influence, that freedom of debate which is essential to a free council. They are, therefore, not to take notice of any bills or other matters depending, or of votes that have been given, or of speeches which have been held, by the Members of either of the other branches of the legislature, until the same have been communicated to them in the usual parliamentary manner.

Then in section 364:

It is a breach of order in debate to notice what has been said on the same subject in the other House, or the particular votes or majorities on it there; because the opinion of each House should be left to its own independency, not to be influenced by the proceedings of the other; and the quoting them might beget reflections leading to a misunderstanding between the two Houses.

At that time the Chair held that whether these rules with regard to comity prevailed in the Senate or not they did prevail in the House, and if the Chair may be indulged, because he thinks it is perhaps worth while, he will read a few sentences from his decision on that occasion:

There would seem to be but two alternatives for us to adopt in dealing with this situation.

And precisely the same situation is before us now as was then.

If the House desired to retaliate, it might, by rule, provide that these rules in Jefferson's Manual relating to comity between the two Houses should not apply to proceedings in the House. In other words, to say that Members of the House should be guided solely by their own discretion in making any comment, insinuation, or attack upon any Senator, or any proceeding of the Senate.

The other alternative is to rigidly insist upon strict adherence to both the spirit and letter of Jefferson's Manual.

In the opinion of the Chair, the adoption of the first alternative would be violative of the spirit in which the House for 140 years has followed the precepts of Thomas Jefferson in our manner of association and dealing with the other legislative body. After all, Jefferson's general precepts are but a restatement of the manner in which all legislative bodies, particularly the British Parliament, have dealt with each other for centuries. They are but a restatement of what is and ought to be true sportsmanship in the dealings between the legislative branches of great governments.

The Chair is firm, and he believes that the House will remain firm in our adherence to the rules of sportsmanship and comity as laid down in Jefferson's Manual.

Later on the Chair said:

The question raised by the gentleman from New York [Mr. LaGuardia] is whether a Member may reflect in any way on the floor of the House against the actions, speeches, or proceedings of another Member or of the body itself.

To put it in another way, Shall the House, notwithstanding any adverse action by the other body, adhere to the provisions laid down in Jefferson's Manual, which have always governed?

The answer of the Chair is emphatically "Yes." Indeed, it appears to the Chair that it has become all the more necessary, if the rules of comity between the two Houses are to be at all preserved, that Members of the House should be limited even more rigidly than ever by Jefferson's rules prohibiting reference in terms of the slightest disparagement of the remarks or actions of Members or any of the proceedings of the other body.

If no rules of comity are to be followed in either House, then legislation may become chaos indeed.

In conclusion, the Chair will say that so long as he remains Presiding Officer of this body he will see to it that the rules of Jefferson's Manual, in so far as they apply to the friendly relations between the Members of the two Houses and the Houses themselves, shall be enforced with the utmost rigidity, not only in the letter but in the spirit.

The Chair reaffirms those views upon this occasion. The Chair thinks that there is possibly an alternative and that it might be carefully considered under these conditions. That is to change the rule which provides that Jefferson's Manual shall govern the proceedings of this House; but in the absence of such change the Chair will hold that Members of the House are not permitted to refer in any way disparagingly or in criticism of anything said by Members of the body on the opposite side.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, in view of the decision of the Chair, may I propound another parliamentary inquiry? In what manner can a Member of the House who has been referred to in another branch by name and asked questions either answer the questions or defend himself from the insinuations contained therein?

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not believe he is under the necessity of saying that a Member may not do that outside of this House, but as far as the present occupant of the Chair is concerned he holds that he may not do it in the House.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. MICHENER. Might not the gentleman's object be attained by the unanimous consent of the House?

The SPEAKER. There is a rule in Jefferson's Manual which seems to apply in this case:

Where the complaint is of words disrespectfully spoken by a Member of another House, it is difficult to obtain punishment, because of the rules supposed necessary to be observed (as to the immediate noting down of words) for the security of Members. Therefore it is the duty of the House, and more particularly of the Speaker, to interfere immediately, and not permit expressions to go unnoticed which may give a ground of complaint to the other House.

So long as Jefferson's Manual governs the proceedings of the House, the Chair thinks it is impossible to take any official notice of such remarks as are now complained of. Of course, the alternative is to change the rules.

Mr. DYER. Mr. Speaker, another parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. DYER. Is it not in order to pass a resolution requesting the Senate to expunge from its records and proceedings statements and remarks criticizing or impugning motives of a Member of this body?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks not. The Chair passed on that question shortly before he rendered the decision just quoted. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. LUCE] proposed such a resolution and the Chair declared it was not in order.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to propound a further parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. Where the two Houses are so close together and it takes only a few minutes for a Member of one to reach a Member of the other, is it necessary to go to the trouble to change the rules?

The SPEAKER. The Chair fears the gentleman from Texas did not get the full purport of the Chair's suggestion.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma. In view of the fact that the rule refers to words spoken on the floor, what would be the result if a Member utilized the privilege of extending his remarks in the RECORD, having in mind that the RECORD is so widely read that it would bring about the desired result?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks the same rule exactly would apply.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. CRISP. I am in perfect accord with the ruling of the distinguished Speaker and, as he said, the remedy, if the House does not approve of that ruling, would be to change the rule. Now, this is my inquiry: If a Member of one House makes a speech outside of the Chamber or gives out interviews in the press, would the rule apply then?

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks it applies only to words spoken on the floor and where action is taken on the floor of the House.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, pursuing my inquiry a step farther, my inquiry was: Could not the House do away, so to speak, with the rules of the House by unanimous consent? Inasmuch as the rules of the House are made by the House, can not those rules be waived in any specific instance by the unanimous consent of the House? Of course, in making that inquiry I appreciate the fact that the Speaker is a Member of the House, that the Speaker may exercise his function as a Member of the House even though he is Speaker, and that has been so held where he refuses to recognize for a unanimous-consent request, and in doing that he has in effect exercised his rights as a Member of the House temporarily occupying the chair. If the House were unanimous and the Speaker was acting entirely in his capacity as Speaker, and not in his individual capacity as a Member of the House, and he were in accord with the request of the gentleman propounding the unanimous-consent request, then could we not accomplish by the unanimous consent of the House, including the Speaker in his individual capacity, what is here sought?

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MICHENER. Yes.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. Does not the gentleman think that the language of the rule in Jefferson's Manual practically imposes the duty upon the Speaker of not permitting such a proceeding?

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Michigan is of this opinion: That the rules are the creation of the House; that day after day and time and again we waive rules of the House by unanimous consent, and if we are able to waive the rules of the House in one particular we can then waive them in all particulars and set aside all of the rules of the House in order that the House may function in accordance with its desire. Unless, of course, there is a specific rule to the contrary, and there is no such rule in this case.

Mr. CHINDBLOM. It seems to me that the House itself has imposed upon the Speaker at least this implied duty of not permitting such proceedings.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

The SPEAKER. May the Chair answer the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MICHENER] first? In reply to the gentleman from Michigan, the Chair would not undertake to say it would be impossible that this could be done by unanimous consent, but the Chair would conceive it his duty, in view of the rule he has just read, not to recognize anyone for that purpose. The Chair will repeat the rule:

Where the complaint is of words disrespectfully spoken by a Member of another House, it is difficult to obtain punishment because of the rules supposed necessary to be observed (as to the immediate noting down of words) for the security of Members. Therefore, it is the duty of the House, and more particularly of the Speaker, to interfere immediately and not to permit expressions to go unnoticed which may give a ground of complaint to the other House.

Under this rule the Chair would feel that if there were no change made in the rules he would not recognize a Member for that purpose, but the question involves a very simple proposition. The Chair would recognize the chairman or some member of the Committee on Rules, if the committee thought it advisable to bring in a rule providing for certainly the rest of the session that Jefferson's Manual shall not apply.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, while I have ample ground for a question of personal privilege, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. COX. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. CRAMTON. Then, Mr. Speaker, I rise to a question of personal privilege, and do not ask the consent of anybody. If there is anyone on that side of the House that has any question about it, I withdraw the unanimous-consent request and rise as a matter of right.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his question of personal privilege.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not ask the consent of anybody, and will state my ground of personal privilege. If it has come to the point when we have to risk an objection on that side of the House when a Member of the House is unfairly attacked, I do not ask consent. [Applause.]

Mr. COX. I am in sympathy with the gentleman.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is time, Mr. Speaker, that Republicans have as much right in this House as Democrats. [Applause.] I want to say there is no one on our side of the House who would think of objecting to such a request.

Mr. COX. Will not the gentleman yield.

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not yield.

Mr. COX. I did not intend to object.

Mr. CRAMTON. I renew the request.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. COX. I do not object; but I feel, in view of the gentleman's statement which has drawn an unfavorable inference, because I am in sympathy with the position the gentleman takes.

Mr. CRAMTON. I thank the gentleman.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and the gentleman from Michigan is recognized.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, in another legislative body on two occasions I have been most unfairly attacked with a contemptible disregard of the truth and the facts and, as a result, very serious accusations have gone to the country.

I am completing 18 years of service, and gentlemen on that side of the House know as well as I do that in these 18 years my service has been characterized by the customary courage in the performance of duty and the customary disregard of personal interest. [Applause.] And to me it is no small thing that there should be carried in the press of

the country the direct charge that I have sought through my place on the Appropriations Committee to prepare for myself a job. Anybody who says this is a plain, unadulterated liar. [Prolonged applause, the Members rising.]

There are men on this floor, on both sides of the aisle, Mr. Speaker, who know that the statement printed in the press of the Nation is untrue.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. CRAMTON. There are men on both sides of the aisle who know I have paid no attention whatever to the appropriation—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan yield to the gentleman from Arkansas?

Mr. CRAMTON. I do not yield to anyone.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order— [Cries of "Regular order!"]

The gentleman has made a statement that the gentleman should not make, and I rise to a point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has the right to make a point of order. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. PARKS. And I desire to make it respectfully. The gentleman has used language that is unparliamentary.

Mr. CRAMTON. It is the only language that will adequately picture the occasion.

Mr. PARKS. I am not talking to the gentleman; I am talking to the Speaker. May I proceed, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I think he should make his point of order.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. PARKS. I can not do it when he talks all the time. The gentleman has made a statement here that is unparliamentary and has used language that is unparliamentary, and he has made the statement with reference to a gentleman he would not look in the eye and use the same language.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will make it plain to anybody who will make that charge.

Mr. PARKS. Wait a minute, and we will see whether you will or not. I desire to submit this proposition: Will the gentleman stand here on this floor to-day—

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, I have not yielded for a speech. I protest that I have the floor, and I do not yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PARKS] has the right to make a point of order, but the Chair thinks he should state his point of order.

Mr. PARKS. I am trying to make the point of order, Mr. Speaker, but with the gentleman talking it is a little difficult. Will the gentleman say he does not intend to take a job under this Government?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has not stated a point of order and is not in order.

Mr. CRAMTON. If the gentleman from Arkansas will wait a minute, I will tell him all about it.

Mr. PARKS. I will be grateful.

Mr. CRAMTON. I will say this: If my brother is in want and I have the money, I will not ask the Federal Government to care for him. [Applause.] If I work for the Government and have a salary on which I may live, I have not got to the point that I will ask the Government to send all of my sons to West Point. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, members of the Appropriations Committee of both parties are on the floor, and they all know this to be true: I have never asked the Appropriations Committee to make any appropriation for the Bicentennial Commission. I have paid no attention to those appropriations. I have not even read the item in the pending bill with reference to it.

Furthermore, let me say this for the information of the gentlemen on the Democratic side of the House: Knowing, as you do, that in my work here I have never regarded section or party [applause] and that many of you sat in your seats or voted for it when an unfair question was raised, let me explain to you that I have not as yet asked of this administration any job whatever. [Applause.] I have not asked anybody to ask for any job for me. When the Bicentennial Commission three weeks ago, without my knowledge, without my instigation, were canvassing the field as to whom

they might employ, feeling, as I understand it, that it was needed to have some one, and my name was suggested, I have been advised that every member present at that meeting spoke favorably of the appointment.

Thereafter the vice chairman of the commission asked me whether or not if the position were offered to me I would accept it. I stated that I did not know that I could afford to accept it, but that the work did appeal to me, and at his request I took the matter under advisement.

Then before any controversy was raised here and up until this moment I never have told anybody that I would take the job if offered me.

Mr. PARKS. Will you take it?

Mr. CRAMTON. That is none of the gentleman's business. [Applause.]

Mr. PARKS. I thank the gentleman for his courtesy.

Mr. CRAMTON. The gentleman ought to thank me for my courtesy, because I have had none from him.

Mr. PARKS. Yes; the gentleman has. I assisted him to get an international bridge and then he objected to mine.

Mr. CRAMTON. Mr. Speaker, this country is in a serious situation. A great responsibility rests upon every Member of the House as well as the Senate. I hope we can get to the point where we may legislate on the basis of merit in legislation and not through personalities. [Applause, the Members rising.]

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I move the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 16738) making appropriations for the government of the District of Columbia and other activities chargeable in whole or in part against the revenues of such District for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1932, and for other purposes.

Pending that, I ask unanimous consent that the time for general debate be unlimited as of to-day, that one-half of the time be controlled by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] and one-half by myself.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska moves that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 16738; and pending that, asks unanimous consent that one-half of the time be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. LA GUARDIA in the chair.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY].

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Chairman, a good deal has been said in the last two days in reference to the proposed appropriation on the part of the Federal Government of \$25,000,000 to be expended under the auspices of the Red Cross.

That debate has gone on in both branches, and it caused certain Members to make rather peculiar references. Inquiries have been made as to why individuals may have voted pro and con on some particular item and why, after having voted one way for the Russian relief, the individual referred to would vote another way for Arkansas or other drought-section relief. It is very apparent that there is no comparison between these two kinds of relief nor in the type of votes suggested.

I have made some investigation in reference to the methods of the Red Cross on a previous occasion and I want to repeat what I then said, that it seems to me the Red Cross is particularly a humane means of accomplishing individual relief by the individual giver. It is no disparagement either to that organization to consider that a very great difference arises in the situation when the organization, contrary to its wishes, is asked by the Federal Government to accept an

appropriation from the Federal Government and in that way do away with the possibility of future individual contributions to the cause of that organization.

Assuming that the proceedings of Congress are correctly reported in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, I believe questions were asked me in another body yesterday which, of course, it would be impossible for me to answer here. I understand these questions had to do with Federal contributions to the Red Cross for relief in the drought sections of the South and West, and also referred to a Federal appropriation for the relief of suffering as the result of a fire in a Massachusetts city. I maintain that the questions are not analogous. I hold that there is nothing out of place in voting one way on one measure and refusing to vote for that particular item.

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the Chair maintain order.

Mr. TREADWAY. I decline to yield.

Mr. PARKS. I did not ask the gentleman to yield. I am asking the Chairman to preserve order so that we can hear what the gentleman says.

Mr. TREADWAY. I shall talk loud enough so that the gentleman can hear.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will proceed.

Mr. PARKS. I am going to insist on order whether the gentleman yields or not.

Mr. TREADWAY. Oh, I shall stand right beside the gentleman and talk, if he is afraid that he will not hear me. I thought I had considerable lung power, but if the gentleman is deaf I shall endeavor to take care of the situation. I am perfectly willing that he should hear what I am about to say.

Mr. PARKS. That is such a courteous statement that I shall refrain from answering it.

Mr. TREADWAY. It is discourteous when I ask not to be interrupted to have the gentleman interrupt me.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, in the interest of harmony I think I ought to talk a little bit. [Laughter.]

Mr. TREADWAY. I was asked certain questions in the other body yesterday, and under the very strict ruling of the Speaker, with which I thoroughly agree, under the rules I am prohibited on this occasion from answering those questions. Therefore I am going to speak in an entirely hypothetical way and make no reference to any individual Member of this or any other body. However, if I were fortunate enough to have a brother, I would not publish the fact that I was not willing to aid him in distress by at least furnishing him with clothes sufficient to warrant his attendance at church—and that statement goes. Further than that, if an offer of a position of influence at a good fair salary were made to a man who has distinguished himself for many years in public service, I would not complain about it, particularly if I lived in a glass house that would have its windows broken by the stones that I throw, when the records show that two of my sons had been appointed to West Point, one of them by a Member from another State where I did not live, and the other by a Senator from a State in which I did live. That is the second proposition.

As a third proposition, I would make an effort to be truthful when I said that a certain Member of this branch had been lobbying around the corridors of the Senate to secure an appointment for his brother to public office to such an extent that he interfered with the conduct of the business in the other body. I would at least have an element of truth back of me if I made such a statement. Then, to reach another proposition, although it is somewhat personal, when the governor of my State, now a Member of the United States Senate, not a member of my political party, but of the political party of a certain man, made a recommendation to Congress for an appropriation, I would not find a whole lot of fault if a certain man, not a member of the party to which that governor owed allegiance, voted for an appropriation requested by the governor.

Mr. O'CONNOR of New York. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that under no rule of the House is any discussion permissible on the floor which is hypothetical, be-

cause it may not be within the comprehension of the Members of the House.

Mr. TREADWAY. Oh, I am sure the gentleman from New York will comprehend what I am endeavoring to say in a parliamentary manner, because I realize what large brains the gentleman from New York has.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. TREADWAY. This is not the first time occasions like this have come up. In view of the Speaker's ruling here a short time ago, I say in the interest of fair play and comity between the two branches, that either another branch of Congress should revise its rules and its method of procedure, or that we should. [Applause.] I, for one Member of Congress, ask only for fair play, and I want the same privilege of repartee or reply or answer to inquiries made of me that any Member would assert as his rights in the other body. I do not think it will lead to good agreement between the two branches to have two sets of rules, and therefore the suggestion that our able Speaker has made is very apropos, that we should change our procedure to compare favorably with permissions granted in the other branch.

Mr. Chairman, can you or any Member of this branch so far forget etiquette or courtesy to speak in a derogatory manner of the Presiding Officer of the other branch, or in a facetious way refer to the Presiding Officer of this branch, if you were speaking in the Senate? Read yesterday's RECORD. I ask the Members of this House to read carefully the remarks to which I am addressing my remarks. I can not speak in as open and frank a manner as I would like to do or as the occasion warrants. I was very glad that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON] made the remarks that he did and in the manner he did, because the occasion warrants it; and we are not going to sit here, no matter how disgraceful the remarks may be made in the other branch, and take that sort of talk and keep quiet about it. At least I shall not in my feeble way, anyway, and I think the other Members of the House have just as much red blood as I have. We are not going to sit here and allow that type of abuse to be sent out over the country against individual Members of this House, from the Speaker down. [Applause.] We intend to defend ourselves; and, if the present rules will not permit that, then they ought to be changed; and there has been some talk of a change of the rules lately.

I did not hear the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] suggest any change of this nature, but I should be glad if the gentleman from Georgia would include in his change-of-rule program, a rule that will permit us to give as good as is given to us.

I think the last thing we want to do is to have a man with a glib tongue insult Members of this House intentionally and continuously, year after year; because this is no new attack. It dates back to the time when Speaker GILLET occupied the chair, to my certain knowledge. A freedom of speech may on certain occasions be a valuable asset; but we know of many people "who get in Dutch" by being too free with their tongues, and that has happened within a very few hours in another legislative body.

Therefore I join the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] if the gentleman desires to offer an amendment to the rules that will permit us to say truthful things—not untruthful or dishonest or wrong things or exaggerations or any other adjective which it is desired to use that will describe the kind of speech I am referring to, but that will permit us, men as we are, to defend our rights and to defend the good name of this House. If the good name of this House is criticized through the instrumentality of references to one man, the Speaker alone—leaving the rest of us ordinary Members out of it—when the Speaker of this House is facetiously attacked as he was yesterday in another branch, I say it is time the House arose in its might and showed where it stands on that sort of attack. [Applause.] I am ready to join with the gentleman from Georgia in revising the rules to that extent, at least.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I have endeavored to keep my remarks within parliamentary limits and within the ruling of

our distinguished Speaker made a few minutes ago and at the same time I think in an indirect manner I have said what I would have been glad to say, and with considerably more emphasis and force, if I had not been under the curb and restraint of abiding by the decision of our Speaker. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] has expired.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT].

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, in the words of the great Webster, after the ship has been tossed hither and thither through the storm of turbulent waters, the mariner looks at his compass to see where he is; and now that the storm is over and tranquillity is restored, I desire to talk for a few minutes about some proposed legislation that is of national importance and significance.

Because the time allotted to me is limited, I respectfully ask the Members of the House who have questions to propound to reserve those questions until I have made my statement, and I shall then, if time permits, be glad to answer any questions that I can.

Because my constituency is vitally and directly affected, and at the request of many of my colleagues on both sides of this House, I now rise to speak in support of the bill S. 4123, as amended by the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, commonly and generally known as the Glenn-Smith or drainage bill.

Briefly, the provisions of this act authorize an appropriation of \$95,000,000, to be administered by the Secretary of the Interior, advanced to drainage and irrigation districts in distress, over a period of 40 years, bearing interest at the rate of 3 per cent per annum. This bill, which was introduced in the Senate last session, passed the Senate before the adjournment of Congress last year without a dissenting vote. Long and extensive hearings were held before the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation on a similar measure, and this House measure has been reported unanimously and favorably by that committee.

The Rules Committee last week gave us a hearing of three days, which 135 Members of this House had petitioned them to do, asking for a rule to bring this bill onto the floor of this House for consideration at the present session of Congress. Since those hearings closed last week a half dozen Members who are most directly and vitally interested in this legislation have called on the Secretary of the Interior, and also the President, and found them most sympathetic and willing to consider seriously the provisions contained in this bill.

Drainage and irrigation districts are so numerous and widely scattered throughout our Union, extending all the way from Ohio to California and from the Great Lakes to the Gulf, that the serious crisis that now confronts us is not a local one but is national in its scope and importance.

I wish to say the entire Missouri delegation in Congress, including the 2 Senators as well as the 16 Representatives, are whole-heartedly and unreservedly in favor of the passage of this bill.

We have in our State two and one-half million acres of drained lands, and of that total amount, four-fifths, or 2,000,000 acres, are located in the eight counties of the alluvial valley of the Mississippi, in southeast Missouri, most of which are in my district. Over 230,000 of my constituents live in those drainage districts. When I was born—and since my name is "Dewey" most of you can well remember that time—southeastern Missouri was an impenetrable swamp, but at the beginning of the present century the pioneer men and women who have builded this Nation with heroic courage, with indefatigable energy, by practicing strict economy and frugality, went into southeast Missouri and, through perseverance and suffering, turned that mosquito-breeding, disease-infested swamp into a paradise.

In 1903 the first drainage ditch was dug. There are now 112 drainage districts in the congressional district I have the honor to represent. They have dug over 3,000 miles of canal

and removed more dirt than was removed in the excavation of the Panama Canal. This was accomplished, if you please, by issuing drainage bonds, counting the interest coupons thereon, to the amount of \$53,000,000. In addition to that drainage indebtedness my people have spent \$75,000,000 more in clearing, fencing, and improving those farm lands. Altogether, they have actually spent \$128,000,000 in reclaiming that marshland in southeast Missouri, and which is to-day as fertile as any under the face of the shining sun.

It has been my privilege to have seen some of the rich spots of this earth. I have gone down the Tigris and the Euphrates; I have gone down the Ganges in India; I have gone up the fertile valley of the Nile in Egypt and over the blue Danube in Europe; and I state here, without any fear of contradiction, that nowhere in the world can you find soil more fertile and unsurpassed in its productivity than you will find in southeast Missouri.

That land is in a state of high cultivation. Malaria was stamped out; health conditions have been improved; transportation was made possible; communication of ideas was advanced; and we have created a great national asset to our country which put millions of dollars in taxes for the 10-year period prior to 1925 into our Federal Treasury. Cotton, corn, and wheat, the great staples, are grown there in abundance; also alfalfa, soybeans, and cow peas.

From 1903 to 1925 my people prospered and succeeded in meeting their maturing obligations by paying off over \$20,000,000 of those drainage bonds. Since that time, with the beginning of agricultural depression and the general decline in the prices of farm commodities, due to drought, due to hurricanes, due to constant and recurring floods, over which no human being had any control, those people have been reduced to a state of bankruptcy. In 1920 not 1 per cent of all the land in that district was delinquent in the payment of its taxes, but to-day over 80 per cent of all those farm lands are delinquent. Though we have reduced the death rate from malaria, dysentery, and other kindred maladies 75 per cent in the past 10 years, that rate has been increasing within the past two or three years because of the inability of my people to pay off these drainage bonds and their mortgage indebtedness.

To-day if you would go to my district this is the condition you would find: Industry paralyzed; transportation crippled; banks closed, over a score of them in my district within the past year; farms mortgaged; people out of employment and leaving their homes, not knowing which way to go. The light of day has died out of their eyes; the faith in their hearts is no longer there; hope has waned; their spirits are almost broken, and they are now looking to the Federal Government, not for charity but for a loan.

There are two things in the consideration of this measure which I trust the Members of this House will constantly bear in mind. The first is that this bill is not a dole. The people whom I have the honor to represent are not beggars. They are fighters. All they ask is a fighting chance. What we want is credit restored, because business is based upon credit, and credit is based upon confidence. We are not asking a gift. We are asking assistance long enough to enable us to get back on our feet and meet our maturing obligations. If this bill should become a law and if the time of the payment of these bonds is extended over a 40-year period and the rate of interest cut in two, from 6 to 3 per cent, I am confident that my people, who met every single obligation over a 25-year period, up until 1925, can and will meet that obligation in the future. The second thing which I wish to have the Members of this House bear in mind is that this is not a program of expansion; it is a program of conservation.

The money that is authorized to be appropriated in this bill is not to be used for the reclamation of more territory; it is not to open new lands but merely to assist these heroic pioneers, men and women who have invested \$128,000,000 in reclaiming that disease-infested swamp, in improving the status of agriculture, in building up the state of public health, in aiding transportation and the communication of ideas, to hold on to the land they already have.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Who issued these bonds? Were they State bonds or were they issued by the National Government?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Let me say to the gentleman from Maryland that these drainage and irrigation districts are of a quasi-public nature and the bonds were privately issued to the landowners in these various districts.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What is the purpose of the bill? Is it to take up these bonds and then give these people a 40-year period in which to pay the Government? The gentleman has not told us much about the purposes of the bill.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I have not the time to describe the bill in detail. I merely wanted to get the main facts before the House and then if the bill is presented to the House for consideration those intricate features will be discussed. However, I will say to the gentleman that the bondholders will incidentally be helped by the passage of such legislation, and I see no reason why they should not be considered a part of the picture because they helped in the reclamation of this land. This bill, however, is primarily for relief of farmers and not bondholders.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I did not mean that the bondholders should not receive some benefit out of it, but I wanted to know whether these bonds were State bonds or national bonds?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. They are bonds issued by private corporations and sold to individuals.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Is it not true that if this bill is passed these bondholders would be obliged to reduce their bonds to the actual value of the property so that the loan which the Government makes would only be on the actual value of the property as of to-day?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I think the gentleman is absolutely correct, because section 4 of the bill authorizes the Secretary of the Interior in administering the provisions of the act and in carrying it out to negotiate with the bondholders, many of whom, I know, will be willing to accept a great reduction, below par value.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. COLE. The rate of interest is how much?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Three per cent. The Senate bill carried no rate of interest at all, but the House Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation put in 3 per cent.

Mr. COLE. This may be all right, but if we are going to do this for these particular landowners, I see no reason why the Government of the United States should not refund all the farm mortgages at 3 per cent.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. In answer to the gentleman's statement I wish to say there is a distinct difference. The individual farmers in drainage districts have to meet the same individual obligations that farmers generally over the country have to meet. They are all subject to the same school, State, and county tax, and farmers in the west end of my district where I happen to live are not affected in the same way as farmers in the east end of my district, because in addition to paying their State and county and school tax they must pay the additional burden of their drainage tax and of the mortgage indebtedness. For instance, farmers in these drainage districts, particularly those I have the honor to represent, are now paying from \$1 to \$3 an acre drainage tax. They pay from 50 cents to \$1.50 per acre school and State and county tax and they are paying from \$1.25 to \$3 per acre on the mortgage indebtedness on that land, making the total tax on land in these drainage areas all the way from \$3 to \$7 per acre, which at the present time, because of the general decline in prices of farm commodities, is an unbearable burden.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. HOLADAY. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman five minutes additional.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I yield to my good friend and able colleague from Missouri.

Mr. DYER. Will the gentleman state, before he concludes, what part of the country other than southeast Missouri is concerned in regard to this proposed drainage legislation?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I shall say that 34 States of our Union, a vast majority of our States, and 135 Members of this House are so directly and vitally affected by this proposed legislation that they have petitioned the Rules Committee and appeared before the Rules Committee last week at its hearing urging them to adopt a rule that will allow us to bring this bill on the floor of the House for consideration.

Mr. HASTINGS and Mr. DICKSTEIN rose.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I may say in addition that the reason I have discussed southeast Missouri or our State is because I am more familiar with that than I am with other regions of our country, although Ohio has more of these drainage bonds than any other State. Michigan also has them, as well as Iowa, Minnesota, California, and every State throughout the Middle West and the far West of our country.

I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. HASTINGS. I just want to break in to say that I am very much interested in this proposed legislation. My State of Oklahoma in a measure is similarly situated to the district which the gentleman from Missouri so ably represents, and I was going to ask the gentleman what is the amount that is authorized to be appropriated in this bill?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Ninety-five million dollars in the present bill, but not more than \$19,000,000 a year will be appropriated.

Mr. HASTINGS. Does the gentleman from Missouri think that that appropriation would be adequate?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I do not. I think additional appropriations would have to be made later on.

Mr. HASTINGS. I hope they will be made.

Mr. LINTHICUM. If the gentleman will yield, may I inquire if this is down in the neighborhood of Cape Girardeau?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. LINTHICUM. I want to say to the gentleman that it was Maryland people who went to that section and were among the first settlers there and helped to develop that country.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I appreciate very much that statement. They are mighty good people, and I wish we could get more of them.

Mr. COX. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I yield to the distinguished lawyer from Georgia.

Mr. COX. In differentiating between your case and any other debt-ridden community of the country, as I understand, the difference is that you simply owe one form of obligation that the others do not carry.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. That is right, and it is of a public nature rather than a private, individual matter.

Mr. COX. Just what are its characteristics that give it a public nature and entitle it to preferential treatment over other sections which have their burdens similar to those of the gentleman's section?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Improvement of public health is one of the greatest benefits, and the gentleman from Georgia, being a very conspicuous member and a very able member of the Committee on Flood Control and having gone up and down the Mississippi Valley all the way from New Orleans to Cape Girardeau, well realizes that if the Federal Government does not assist these people to hold on to these rich lands that have been reclaimed, the Federal Government itself will have to go in there and stamp out malaria, dysentery, and other diseases.

Mr. COX. In order to entitle the gentleman's district to preferential treatment, does not the gentleman think it necessary to predicate his case entirely upon the question of public health?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Public health and facilitating rapid transit of the United States mails and making possible transportation of commodities and the communication of ideas between peoples adjacent to this drainage area of the United States.

Mr. COX. How would transportation be affected by failure to refinance this obligation?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I will say to the gentleman there are thousands of miles of paved highways, railroads, telephone and telegraph wires in my district, and if southeast Missouri allows the 2,000,000 acres there to revert to swamp, this will mean not only the individual farmers, but all public utilities of that vast region will absolutely be driven from that section.

Mr. COX. One more statement, if the gentleman will permit. I did visit this community with the gentleman and the improvements which the gentleman has detailed have been made and in my judgment it is the most fertile section of the entire country, of course, with the exception of Georgia.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. I have been very much interested in the eloquent way in which the gentleman is presenting his bill, but it would be interesting to know whether this will be in the nature of a gift out of the Federal Treasury or a new loan.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Oh, not at all; it is not a gift; we are not asking for charity; it is not a dole.

Mr. WAINWRIGHT. Would this loan go along with the existing encumbrance on the property, or would it take it up?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. It would take it up, or the Government's loan would be first lien on the property. I want to say that indiscriminate and careless giving is not only a silly and sentimental philanthropy but is conducive to the perpetuation of poverty and indolence.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. If this bill passes there will be no mortgages created on the property and the actual value of the property will be the safest security for the Government.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I think so.

Mr. LETTS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. LETTS. Is it not true that in many instances the State and county taxes are delinquent?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Over 80 per cent in my district.

Mr. LETTS. What provision have you for the care of that situation and relieving the land from the lien for taxes?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I might say that in some States the local government has been most generous and considerate by reducing the assessed valuation on the land.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has again expired.

Mr. CANNON. I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman from Missouri yield?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. BRIGGS. As I understand this legislation, it is predicated on the general-welfare clause of the Constitution.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. That is right.

Mr. BRIGGS. And it is only an extension of the present reclamation policy of the Government?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. That is partially correct.

Mr. BRIGGS. Has the Rules Committee indicated what their attitude is as to granting a rule for this legislation?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. They have not indicated what they will do, but they were very sympathetic and generous in the hearings.

Mr. BRIGGS. The gentleman knows there is a strong sentiment existing in the House in favor of the legislation.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I have no doubt that the bill would pass this House if we can get a rule to consider it.

Mr. IRWIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I yield.

Mr. IRWIN. Is it not a fact that this applies to 135 or 150 congressional districts in the United States, perhaps not as acute as in the gentleman's district.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. That is a fact. No single cure can be offered for the farmers' ills, for the causes are many and complex. This proposed legislation will not cure all of the ills of the farmer, but it will go a long way toward helping 5,000,000 of our farm population that are in sore distress.

Mr. HOPE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. HOPE. Did I understand the gentleman to say that some of these drainage districts now have outstanding indebtedness which is more than the value of the land itself?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. I do not think I made that statement.

Mr. HOPE. I understood the statement to be made by some one.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. There are, perhaps, some districts in that unfortunate condition; but if there are, then those districts under the provisions of this bill could not receive loans from the Secretary of the Interior. The matter is wholly within his discretion.

Mr. HOPE. Is it contemplated that the Secretary will make loans up to the full value of the land?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Oh, no; not at all. He will only make safe loans to districts that he can be reasonably sure will meet their obligations.

Mr. HOPE. What is the limit that this bill imposes upon the Secretary?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield to me to answer that?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Certainly.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. The proposition is this. If I own a farm and have a valuation of it in my bond of \$75 an acre, and the Interior Department thinks that \$40 is enough for the land, and is willing to make a \$40 loan, then it is up to the bondholders to accept that. If they do accept it, then the farmer can go back on the land and have 40 years in which to pay for it. It is a meritorious bill on that account.

Mr. HOPE. Do I understand that the Secretary has authority under this bill to loan up to the actual value of the land?

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. It is in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior to determine the actual valuation of the property, and he can not loan beyond the actual value.

Mr. HOPE. It does not seem to me that it would be very good security for the Government to loan up to the entire value of the land.

Mr. WILLIAM E. HULL. There is a clause in there that prevents that.

Mr. HOPE. Nobody would make a loan of that kind.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Yes.

Mr. COX. Unless something is done to give relief to the people of that community, they will have to abandon their properties, and they will revert to a wild, desolate state, and the expenditures already made will have been wasted.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. Absolutely.

Mr. COX. And it is of taxing value to the State as well.

Mr. SHORT of Missouri. It would be a great economic loss to the Nation to allow this land to revert to swamp, not only to the 230,000 people in my district, but to the 5,000,000 people in farming areas in these drainage and irrigation districts. They would suffer the loss of all that they have put into them and the Federal Government would be robbed of one of its greatest sources of revenue. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. BUSBY].

Mr. BUSBY. Mr. Chairman, I am very much interested in the subject being discussed, and if the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Cox] will give me his attention, I desire to deal with the question that he asked a while ago. There is in this proposed legislation no disadvantage whatever to the Government. A great many drainage districts have been organized throughout the country to reclaim lands that are very fertile, to drain lands that were breeding places for malaria and disease. These drainage districts have been going along for 10 or 12 or 15 years, and have largely paid up the original debt that they contracted. They have driven up to the point now, with only a small portion of their debt in many cases, and larger portions in others, where they can not go any further.

What is proposed in this legislation is very much like the proposal in a reclamation project in the arid sections in the West. It is to let the Secretary of the Interior send a man to look over, make survey, and evaluate the project as it is laid out. Perhaps the bondholders will hold bonds to four, three, or two times the value of this project, according to the value placed upon it by the representative of the department. What is to be done? The representative of the Department of the Interior will say that all the Government can see in the project is such and such an amount, and that if the bondholders will agree to settle their bonds on that basis, which is the real value of the district, the Department of the Interior can arrange and make an adjustment for the district with the bondholders. Then whatever obligation is incurred by the Government for the district is secured by the district, and it obligates itself and all of the property in it to meet the obligation incurred by the Government on its behalf. Then it also agrees to pay 3 per cent for the money that is loaned. In other words, it is taking a lot of insolvent situations that are reverting back to their original state and adjust them for the bondholders and the districts for the people where they can not adjust them for themselves. It is making a national asset. There is no use in going out and conquering other countries in order to obtain lands when we should conquer the lands within our own confines. If we will use common sense and do it, we will add greatly to our national wealth, save many farm homes from destruction, and render an efficient service in many ways without a dollar's loss.

Some years ago I began studying the reclamation situation in the West. I thought the Government was being imposed on. I thought the money of the taxpayers was being wasted; but the more I studied those reclamation projects, the more I became convinced that the people went out there and took waste lands that were worth nothing as national assets, and converted them into splendid farming lands. Cities were built upon them, and I venture to say they have paid more income taxes into the National Treasury than the Treasury has put into the revolving fund with which to reclaim those arid stretches of land. [Applause.] That is the situation with reference to these drainage projects. They will pay more income tax when we have put them back on their feet than we will ever be called on to advance to reclaim them from their present condition. The reclamation fund started out with about \$150,000,000, and it has grown with the interest collected until it is about \$200,000,000, and it is still growing. It is not a waste of funds for the Government to assist to reclaim lands; it is not a waste of effort; it is not a dole, but it is using common sense on the part of our National Government to take care of and make usable national assets, and to help people do a thing they can not do by themselves. I do not want anyone to think that the Government is likely to lose money by helping to adjust the business of the reclamation of drainage districts and to reclaim the lands that make our Government and country great and wealthy as it is. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 40 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Crisp].

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman and my colleagues, I regret I do not see the gentleman from New York [Mr. Snell] in the Chamber.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order of no quorum.

Mr. CRISP. I hope my colleague will not do that.

Mr. COX. Very well. I withdraw the point of order, with the permission of the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. CRISP. I have sent word to the office of the gentleman from New York [Mr. Snell] that I was about to address the House.

Gentlemen, I shall conduct this discussion in the utmost good humor. I do it because I think it is the proper way to discuss a matter of rules, and for the further reason that I am not making any fight for a change of the rules for partisan purposes, but am making it in what I conceive to be for the interest of the entire membership of the House. [Applause.] I am certain in my own mind some of my colleagues on this side may not agree with all of the changes I propose. I am equally certain there are a number of gentlemen on the other side who will whole-heartedly favor them, and I am convinced that a majority of the membership of the next House, irrespective of political affiliations, will favor them, and that, in substance, they will be adopted as the rules of the Seventy-second Congress. [Applause.]

I do not blame the gentleman from New York [Mr. Snell] at all for replying to my address. When I made it I invited reply. I was prepared then, as I am prepared now, to defend every position I took, anywhere, and at all times. I will be perfectly content and happy if the distinguished Speaker and majority leader will see fit to reply. If they do so, I can have no doubt whatever that the speech I delivered over the radio is having effect on the country and that the gentlemen are hearing from it, and that is what induces them to reply. [Applause.]

Now, the gentleman from New York [Mr. Snell] very correctly stated that the rules of this House are not the product of any one mind or the product of any decade or any number of Congresses, but they are the evolution from rules adopted 150 years ago when this country became organized under the Constitution.

From time to time rules have been changed and modified, and each change has been in favor of liberalizing the rules of the House to give greater power to each of the Members of the House. Gentlemen, the world does not stand still. All animal life and all vegetable life must go forward or die and wither away. The distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. Snell] does not seem to realize that principle, but he desires to operate under the old order of things.

May I say that when man was in a primitive state, the ruler had the right to chop off a man's head, but as man progressed in intelligence and civilization, he would not submit to it, and from early man all through the different ages, men have demanded and received more liberties and more equality, and the evolution of the rules of the House is but carrying out that principle.

The Constitution has been amended in many ways, and each amendment, practically, is to protect the rights of individuals.

Now, as a son, I am going to crave your indulgence if I make a few personal observations. It is not pleasing to me to have to do this, but I am sure under the existing circumstances of the debate that I participate in on the floor of this House relative to changes of the rules, I am justified in what I am going to say. Every time I discuss the rules some one gets up and says, "Those were the rules that governed the House when your father had the honor to preside over its deliberations."

That statement is not true. Many of the rules of the present House are entirely different from the rules when my father was Speaker. The Unanimous Consent Calendar, Calendar Wednesday, and many other things have been added, but I freely admit, gentlemen, that the rules to-day are more liberal than they were during the days when my father was Speaker. At that time the Speaker appointed committees, was chairman of the Rules Committee, and had a complete veto power on all legislation. My father lived

in his day and generation and he measured up to the very highest standards of that time [applause], and was an ornament to it.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. I would like to finish this personal reference and then I will be glad to yield to the gentleman.

I am sincerely of the opinion that my father was the greatest Speaker, the fairest Speaker, and the ablest Speaker this House has ever had. [Applause.] There is one distinguished gentleman in this House, Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin, who served under him, and I have heard him say to me many times since I have been here that very thing.

He was lovable, magnetic, never lost a friend, and was impartial in the discharge of his duties. I have an adoration for him. Never did a boy love his father more than I did mine; but if my father lived to-day he would keep up with the spirit of the times, and he would favor liberalization of the rules of this House, for he always believed in a square deal and that the masses of the people had a right to be protected. [Applause.]

Now I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman did not mean to infer that the gentleman from New York made any disparaging remarks about his father, did he?

Mr. CRISP. I did not.

Mr. SNELL. I certainly did not, and I would apologize if I had.

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman did not. The gentleman is familiar with what took place on the floor of the House, and every time I discuss the rules some one brings that up; and a gentleman, a newspaper writer, George Rothwell Brown, continues to write about it. He is either grossly ignorant or willfully misrepresents the facts; and I do not think he is ignorant.

Now, gentlemen, the first change of the rules that I propose deals with the meeting of committees. I am not going to take up very much time to consider that, for surely every Member of the House believes that a majority of any of the committees of the House should have a right to convene whenever they see fit to do so.

The gentleman from New York says they can do that now, provided, when the committee assembles, it makes provision for the committee to assemble at the request of a majority of its members. That is true, but they do not do it.

The committees of the House are but the agents of the House. The House is the principal. The House delegates certain authority to the committees and surely the principal has the right to make rules for its agents to act under. Under the general parliamentary practice of this House the rules of the House are the rules of the committees, and under the rules of the House a motion to recess is not a privileged motion. Therefore, if a committee met and a member attempted to make a motion to recess until the next day, it would not be in order. The proposal I suggest simply permits a majority of the members of a committee to meet whenever they see fit and it makes in order a motion to recess, so that the committees may function from day to day if they elect to do so. I can not, to save my life, see how anyone can object to that provision of the rules.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the gentleman from Georgia take issue with the statement made by the gentleman from New York that under the present rules of the House the committees may do that?

Mr. CRISP. I do not, and I so stated. I am going to be perfectly frank with the House, and I always am. I have never made a statement on the floor of this House in arguing a point of order to the Chair unless I sincerely believed in it and I have given the reasons why I believed in it.

The gentleman from New York, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee, says—and I quote from his speech, page 3700 of the RECORD:

Never, by one single paragraph in that manual, not by a single sentence or a single word, as far as I know, has this House ever given the Rules Committee any substantive power to control

legislation. It has not given the Rules Committee any substantive power to defeat legislation.

I respectfully take issue with the distinguished gentleman, the chairman of the Rules Committee. The jurisdiction of the Rules Committee is defined in Rule XI, section 35.

All proposed action touching the rules, joint rules, and order of business shall be referred to the Rules Committee.

Paragraph 725 of the same rule provides:

It shall always be in order to call up for consideration a report from the Committee on Rules.

Paragraph 725 (a) of the same rule provides that:

The Committee on Rules shall present to the House reports concerning rules, joint rules, and order of business.

Seven hundred and twenty-six of the same rule provides that:

No committee, except the Committee on Rules, shall sit during the sitting of the House.

If that does not confer absolute power upon the Rules Committee to report to this House what nonprivileged bills shall be considered, I am so obtuse I can not read the English language. I will demonstrate later how the Rules Committee does function; how the Rules Committee does say what nonprivileged bills shall be considered and what bills shall be considered provided a majority of the House votes to adopt a special rule they report.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman in his last statement answered the question I was going to ask; that is, that the Rules Committee may, under the rules, map out the program, but that program must be reported to the House, and that program can not even get started unless a majority of those present and voting wants it started.

Mr. CRISP. My objection to the Rules Committee and the vice of the system, as I see it, is not on the rules they report, for when they report them it takes a majority of the House to adopt them; but the vice, as I see it, the gag rule, as I see it, is when the Committee on Rules pigeonholes in that committee and lets sleep in the dark chambers of the committee room a resolution providing for the consideration of a bill and will not bring it out to the floor and let a majority of the House have an opportunity to act.

I will leave my memorandum as to the order in which I was going to discuss this matter and say that the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] said in his speech that the Committee on Rules had reported 40 rules during the three sessions of this Congress; that 22 bills had been considered under special rules, and that he had some other rules which, for one reason or another, he had not called up. Gentlemen, that leaves 149 rules pending before that committee asking for the consideration of bills, and the vice is that they are gagging the House, smothering those resolutions in the Committee on Rules, and will not give a majority of the House the opportunity of voting as to whether or not they desire to consider them.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. I do not want any wrong impression left in the minds of the Members of the House. Every rule that the Rules Committee has ever reported has been called up unless there was some reason for not calling it up, like a bill having been passed by unanimous consent, or for some reason we had to take the rule back in order to change it or bring out another rule to take care of the particular situation. The statement made by the gentleman from Georgia as to the other resolutions remaining in the committee is correct, but let me say that there is not a committee in this House which reports one-fourth of the resolutions or bills referred to it, and in addition let me say that the Rules Committee has before it 50 or 60 resolutions asking for investigations. Is the gentleman in favor of bringing every one of them before the House?

Mr. CRISP. I am, if 100 Members of the House are interested in them. I am not in favor of bringing everyone

here that 1 or 2 or 3 or 4 Members may desire, for the whole burden of my speech on this subject has been that I do not want chaos, I want orderly procedure in the House. I do not want any rule that will permit a mere handful of men to filibuster and interfere with the procedure of the House, but where there is a public matter of sufficient importance that 100 Members of this House desire the House to pass upon it, they should have the privilege of doing so, and if there are 100 Members interested in any resolution pending before the Rules Committee asking for a special order they are entitled to it.

It has developed in debate here on this floor to-day that there is a bill or resolution pending before the Rules Committee asking that the House be given an opportunity to consider a bill dealing with drainage bonds. It was stated that 135 Members have signed a petition asking the Rules Committee to report this rule. I do not know the merits of this legislation. I do not know whether or not I would support it if it came upon the floor of the House, but I do say that it is the duty of the Rules Committee to give these gentlemen an opportunity to have the bill considered. I do not know what the Rules Committee will do. They may give them a rule, but I say to these 135 Members, whether the Rules Committee gives you a rule or not, if you had the discharge rule that I am going to propose you would certainly get an opportunity to make the House vote on the question.

Mr. SNELL. May I say to the gentleman that we have heard them now for three days?

Mr. CRISP. I am making a perfectly fair statement. I said I did not know what you were going to do and I quoted what was said here. I do not make anything here but fair statements. [Applause.]

Now, the gentleman says that the Rules Committee has no control over legislation. Let me call your attention to an occurrence that happened on the floor of this House in 1922. I have the volume here and I will quote from it. Mr. Campbell, of Kansas, was chairman of the Rules Committee. A debate was had on the floor of the House as to a rule pending before that committee and Mr. MOORE of Virginia said:

In April I introduced a resolution which was sent to the cemetery which is operated by the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Campbell, the chairman of the Rules Committee, a cemetery where all Democratic measures are interred.

Some Member said, "A morgue." Mr. Campbell said:

The Committee on Rules takes into account the bills that the steering committee has shifted into a place for privileged consideration. Then the Committee on Rules provides machinery to consider them.

Mr. Campbell, in that debate, also said:

Facetious comment has frequently been made about the chairman of the Committee on Rules who carries in his hip pocket or his coat pocket rules. If the work of the Committee on Rules continues to grow as it has been growing in the past seven or eight years, they will have to have a calendar for the Committee on Rules instead of a place in the pocket of the chairman for rules that are reported. I have in my pocket now other rules reported by that committee which I have not presented to the House.

The gentleman from New York said in his speech that some of the rules his committee had reported had not been called up.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman misinterprets me there. I gave the gentleman the reason a few moments ago why they were not called up.

Mr. CRISP. I will quote the gentleman verbatim.

Mr. SNELL. I said that for various reasons they were not called up. The gentleman from New York has never carried a committee rule in his pocket and I challenge any man to state once when he ever did.

Mr. CRISP. I do not know what the gentleman carries in his pocket. I do not have access to his pocket. [Laughter and applause.] I just quoted what the gentleman said on the floor of the House here. I will now quote him verbatim:

Up to December 1, 1930, there were 927 measures passed in this House. There were 40 special rules granted, and several of them

were for investigations that have not been considered, and some for one reason or another were not presented. Only 22 pieces of legislation in the first two sessions of the Seventy-first Congress were ever considered under special rules.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. CRISP. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. I have just explained to the gentleman the reason two or three of them were not presented. As a matter of fact, every rule that is presented by the Rules Committee goes on the calendar, and the gentleman can very well find out whether the gentleman from New York has ever pocketed any rules or not; and earlier in the gentleman's statement he said he was going to talk about present-day conditions and not archaic conditions of the past. Now the gentleman is going back to something the gentleman from Kansas, Mr. Campbell, did. The gentleman from New York, the present chairman of the Rules Committee, has never carried a rule in his pocket.

Mr. CRISP. Gentlemen, there is an old saying, "The hit bird flutters."

Mr. SNELL. No; he does not flutter in this case.

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman from New York is fluttering.

Mr. SNELL. I deny the statement the gentleman has made, and I would like to have him recall a specific instance where I have ever done that.

Mr. CRISP. I told the gentleman I did not know what he did.

Mr. SNELL. Then do not make the charge here unless you know.

Mr. CRISP. Well, I will quote what the gentleman said on the floor of the House here or anywhere else. [Applause.]

Mr. SNELL. If the gentleman makes a charge, he should substantiate it, and that is what I am asking the gentleman to do.

Mr. CRISP. I have told the gentleman that I do not know what he has in his pocket.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman can not substantiate the charge, and he knows it.

Mr. HUDDLESTON. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order. The gentleman from New York is interrupting without permission.

Mr. SNELL. Oh, the gentleman yielded to me.

Mr. CRISP. I yielded to the gentleman, and I am in perfect good humor about this.

Mr. BLANTON. The chairman of the Rules Committee does not need permission, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. CRISP. I am in perfect good humor, and I am delighted to yield to the gentleman from New York; perfectly so.

Now, let me tell you what the gentleman from New York said further in that speech, and I am quoting from page 3700;

It is the duty of the Rules Committee, as I understand it, to act, as far as possible, for the protection of the administration and the administration program of legislation.

The gentleman from New York evidently thinks the Rules Committee should have the power to censor what bills the House shall consider.

In his speech the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] compares the House of Representatives to a private corporation, intimating that the members of the Rules Committee are the directors and the other members the stockholders. The whole burden of that part of his speech was to the effect that the directors controlled the affairs and the stockholders' province was to submit and, at the end of the year, if they did not like the management of the directors, they might elect new ones. I can not subscribe to any such fallacy. The House of Representatives should not be likened to a private corporation or a civic organization, but it is one of the two coordinate bodies provided for by the Constitution of the United States to represent the people of the Nation in legislative matters. Each Congressman represents a constituency, and each is entitled to as much consideration in that body as another. I must confess, it seems to me the Rules Committee acts on the theory intimated by the distinguished gentleman from New York.

The gentleman from New York does protect the administration. Seventy-five per cent of this House might be interested in considering some nonprivileged bill of great public import, but if the administration does not desire it, if the leaders of the House do not desire it considered, they sit on the lid and will not let the resolution come out of the Rules Committee to consider it.

Now, our fathers in organizing this Government provided three coordinate branches—the executive, the legislative, and the judicial. The executive branch has nothing to do with what bills this Congress considers. [Applause.] It is none of their function; it is none of their business.

The President has the right to recommend to Congress such legislation as he sees fit, but it is the imperative duty, the power, and the right of the House to consider any legislation it sees fit. If it passes, when it reaches the other end of Pennsylvania Avenue, if it does not meet with the approval of the President it is his duty and right to veto it. When he vetoes it, it comes back to Congress. It is a privileged motion. Then the representatives of the people and the Senate have the right to vote to overrule it, and if it gets two-thirds to vote for it, it becomes a law.

But under the present system, if the leaders of the House do not desire a bill to be considered, they sit on the lid; they do not let it come out; they exercise a more autocratic veto power than any President of the United States exercises.

Now, does the Committee on Rules refuse to report out resolutions? I have called your attention to the number they have had and the number they have reported out and the number they have not reported out.

Gentlemen, you do not have to take my word for the fact that the Rules Committee has exercised almost complete control as to which nonprivileged bills of the House of public import are considered and which are not considered. You have seen it operating, you have seen the machinery, the roller, and you know it as well as I do. I repeat that I have no fault to find with the Rules Committee when it reports out for consideration a special order whether it is a hog-tying rule or not, because it can not be adopted unless a majority of the House agrees to it.

My fight is to put it in the power of a majority of the House to consider a measure, irrespective of the fact that the leaders or the administration do not want it considered.

I criticize them only when they refuse to take a bill up in the committee room and will not give the House an opportunity to consider it.

Now, the distinguished chairman of the Rules Committee said that the discharge rule is the most important rule that I am going to propose. Unquestionably it is, and the gentleman from New York makes an earnest appeal to let his committee stand out above all others and not to let the vicious rule apply to this sacred Committee on Rules.

Let me quote. He says:

I am sure the common sense of this House will not allow you to use this new discharge rule against the Rules Committee and thereby destroy the very purpose for which the House itself created the Rules Committee, namely, to enable it to function as it wanted to at all times.

I think that language was a slip on the gentleman's part, although it speaks the truth. I think the gentleman had in mind that the Rules Committee should be allowed to function as it wanted to function at all times. That is what they think. Probably the gentleman meant in his argument that the House could function as it wanted to at all times. However, he did say let the Rules Committee do as it wanted to. That is what they do now under the rules.

The language is capable of two constructions, and the gentleman probably meant to say that the House could do what the House wanted to. As a matter of fact, the House can not do it under the present rules.

The gentleman referred to the discharge rule under the Democratic control and said that there was a joker in it—that you could only call up a bill after you had called through the Unanimous-Consent Calendar and Suspensions. That was true, and the Republicans in the Sixty-sixth and Sixty-

seventh Congresses had that rule word for word, and I was the one, if I may be permitted to say so, who discovered the joker. I proposed—

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. Let me finish this.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I wanted to—

Mr. CRISP. I decline to yield, if the gentleman will not desist when I courteously ask him to wait. After the occurrence on the floor of the House with Mr. Campbell the rules dealing with the Committee on Rules were amended to provide that when the Rules Committee authorized the report of a special rule, if it was not called up within three days, it should go on the calendar, and then if the chairman did not call it up within nine days the Committee on Rules could direct some other Member to call it up—another evolution, trying to get away from autocratic procedure on the part of a few in control. In the next Congress I proposed a discharge rule, and it was adopted with two changes. The rule that I proposed provided that 100 Members could initiate the proceeding, but in drafting the rule I did not confine it to public bills. The House adopted that rule, changing the "100" to "150," and made it applicable to public bills, and if you will notice that rule, I provided that the motion should be in order immediately after the approval of the Journal, and I stood two days on this floor and debated it and showed why the change was made, that it was to prevent the very situation that the gentleman from New York pointed out, that if you had to wait until you had called all the committees it would not operate. Who killed Cock Robin? I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Oh, no; I follow the gentleman, and I shall yield to him.

Mr. CRISP. I yielded to the gentleman, and I asked him courteously to wait until I finished that statement. I said I would yield afterwards. If the gentleman does not care to interrogate me, it is immaterial to me. I am perfectly good humored, and I made up my mind when I took this floor that I was not going to get ruffled.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I hope the gentleman will not get ruffled by the question that I ask him. The gentleman states he wants to be fair, and I think he does want to be fair, but outward appearances do not always indicate that.

The gentleman was the parliamentary clerk here from 1911 to 1913. He was a Member of the House from 1913 to 1918, and during those eight years the Democrats were in complete control. Would it not be fair or fairer at least to state or let the country know that during all of the time the Democrats were in power the gentleman never did suggest anything here that would liberalize the discharge rule, which everybody concedes was ineffective?

Mr. CRISP. I think the gentleman has asked the question, and he should let me answer it now. I do not want to be discourteous, but if you will give me unlimited time, I am willing to stand here until I drop on this floor to answer every question anyone will propound.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I do not want to go as far as that. I quit.

Mr. CRISP. I will answer the gentleman. I did not make any suggestions of any change in any of the rules during the Democratic administration. I was a new Member, and I have never, if I may be permitted to say it, tried to push myself forward, but I do say to the gentleman that as far as any law, any code of rules that are adopted, is concerned, how they work depends upon the men who handle them and execute them; and under the Democratic régime we did not have this procedure that we have now. There was not a complaint of the rules then as the complaint has been since, and the complaint of the present procedure is not confined to the Democratic side of the House, but it is largely on the Republican side also—so much so, gentlemen, that while you have a paper majority of two for the organization of the next House, you know that unless these rules are liberalized you will not be able to get all of the independent, freethinking men on the

Republican side to vote with you, and you will not organize the House unless the rules are liberalized, and you know it.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. As I understand the procedure in the House, and the organization of the House, the first thing to do is to organize and elect your officers, and then comes the adoption of the rules. That is an entirely different proposition. A man could very well vote for whoever he wished to for Speaker and still vote against the rules or for the rules. Why does that necessarily depend upon the election of the Speaker or the other officers of the House?

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman states the situation correctly, but a number of men on the gentleman's side of the House are not so gullible or simple as to vote for the Republican nominee for Speaker unless they have assurance that these rules are to be changed, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRISP. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. Has the gentleman's prospective leader, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER], promised these proposed changes that the gentleman is talking about at the present time?

Mr. CRISP. The gentleman from Texas is 21, and I shall let him speak for himself. I say this to the gentleman: When I prepared and introduced this discharge rule, Mr. GARNER did not know anything in the world about it; he had never seen it and I had never discussed it with a single Member of the House. No one knew what I was going to do. I introduced it, and I am doing so on my own responsibility as a Member, trying to liberalize the rules of the House. What the gentleman from Texas [Mr. GARNER] has said to others I know not, but it is my judgment that Mr. GARNER will support this change.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield, for information?

Mr. CRISP. Certainly.

Mr. SLOAN. In the discharge of these committees of various bills, is there a limit placed as to the number of discharges as to which each man may sign his name or may not, and might not the minority congest the calendar much more than it has been congested under the rules of the present and preceding régimes?

Mr. CRISP. I will answer the gentleman. It could unquestionably congest the discharge calendar more than it has under the present discharge rule, for there is not a single one on it and not a single one can get on it under these rules, but I do not believe the House of Representatives would be so silly as to pile up the calendar with motions to discharge for the purpose of filibuster or delay; but even admitting they would be so silly, that only can apply 2 days in the month, and in a long session of Congress there would not be more than 10 or 12 days when the rule would apply, and before the rule can apply the bill must be in committee 30 days, and only once can the rule be applied to any particular bill. When there has been one motion to discharge and that has been disposed of either by adoption or rejection by the House, another motion can not be filed against that bill.

I think I have answered the gentleman frankly.

Mr. SLOAN. Not from my viewpoint; but the point was the congestion of the other—

Mr. CRISP. Well, I may say to my friend that I think I answered him frankly and candidly.

Mr. SLOAN. The gentleman did not understand my question. The congestion I referred to was not the congestion of the discharge calendar but the congestion of the various other calendars which we have in the House, which, in a way, control and give precedence to legislation.

Mr. CRISP. The other calendars are unquestionably congested, and many of them, in the natural order of events, can not be considered. Many bills will be reported from committees and die because they can not be reached.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. CRISP. I dislike to trespass on the time of the House, but I have yielded to so many questions and I have not really answered some of them.

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] 15 additional minutes.

Mr. CRISP. Now, gentlemen, please do not interrupt me. I have yielded, but I think I should have a chance now to conclude.

Mr. SIMMONS. I will be glad to yield whatever additional time is required to answer the question which I wish to ask the gentleman.

Mr. CRISP. Very well.

Mr. SIMMONS. If I understood the gentleman's statement correctly, it is the gentleman's opinion that under the present discharge rule it is practically impossible to get a bill before the House?

Mr. CRISP. Absolutely; a nonprivileged bill.

Mr. SIMMONS. Under that statement, am I correct in drawing the conclusion that the procedure suggested by some Members of the House of securing the discharge of the Committee on Ways and Means on the so-called Patman bill to pay cash on the bonus was a futile undertaking?

Mr. CRISP. It was futile for two reasons: Under the rule you could not get 218 Members to sign it, but if you got that, then you had to have 218 votes by tellers. The rule says you can not call the roll, but you have to have 218 pass through tellers; and when that was done, the committee was directed in 15 days to report the bill and it was to go on the calendar. It is a nonprivileged bill, and if it was reported favorably by the committee or reported under that rule and went on the calendar, it is nonprivileged, and 80 per cent of the Members of this House—and I repeat that statement—80 per cent of the Members of this House desiring to get it considered could not do so without a revolution, by overturning the rules, unless the Rules Committee brought in a rule for its consideration.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then, as I say, the proceedings with reference to the Patman bill were futile?

Mr. CRISP. Well, I think it was to show their earnest desire, but if you had the rule I propose it would not have been futile. One hundred and eighteen Members would sign that. If you had the rule I propose, I would have had a little special-order rule before the Rules Committee, a special order for the consideration of that bill, and when 100 Members signed that discharge rule I would have applied it against the Rules Committee and if a majority of the House, a quorum present, voted in the affirmative, that committee would have been discharged and we would have adopted the rule and the House would have proceeded to consider the adjusted-service certificates under the terms of the rule, just as much as if the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] had brought in here a favorable report for consideration of the bill under the rule.

The gentleman from New York says, "Oh, there are certain privileged bills that can come up." Yes. Appropriations. Who in the world ever disputed that appropriation bills could come up? If they do not come up and are not passed, we would have an extra session of Congress, which I hope will not be the case. Then the gentleman says, "The Ways and Means Committee." Later on he said, "You can not pass a tariff bill through the House without a rule; you have to have a rule." Therefore he destroys and negatives his own proposition that a tariff bill can be considered without a rule from the Rules Committee.

Then he says, "Other committees." Yes. The Committee on the Territories is privileged to report a bill admitting a new State. This has not been done since the great State of Oklahoma came into the Union. There will not be another Territory admitted to statehood in years to come.

Is not this a great privilege conferred upon our membership? The gentleman says the Printing Committee can report a resolution providing for printing a document that does not cost more than \$500. A great gift to the House of Representatives!

The chairman of the Committee on Enrolled Bills can quietly slip in the door and leave upon the Speaker's desk,

the enrolled bills that have been passed. Oh, gentlemen, we should be grateful for this consideration.

Gentlemen, the bills in which the country is interested are nonprivileged bills. Bills that come from the following committees are not privileged: Judiciary, Immigration, Banking and Currency, Agriculture, Interstate and Foreign Commerce, Merchant Marine, Flood Control, Foreign Affairs, Military Affairs, Naval Affairs, Irrigation and Reclamation, Education, Labor, Civil Service, Claims, and others. Those are the committees in which the country is interested. But, says the gentleman from New York, "You have Calendar Wednesday." Yes. In the three sessions of this Congress only 18 of the 44 committees have had the call. The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON], on the floor of the House the other day, said the Committee on Immigration had not been called since 1922—nine years. I checked that up and it seems to be correct. So, to consider them on Calendar Wednesday, "Abandon hope all ye who hope to enter here." I quote Mr. JOHNSON literally:

Mr. JOHNSON. There is no way, however, to get them up on the floor except by a rule, by suspension of the rules, or by unanimous consent. It so happens that the last Calendar Wednesday of this Committee on Immigration and Naturalization occurred on April 5, 1922. Think of it—nine years ago! The committee has been recognized by rule occasionally in that long period covering more than four Congresses. (See CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, January 20, 1931, p. 2693.)

I am going to propose an amendment to the Calendar Wednesday rule so that each committee will be limited to one day. That may relieve the situation some and permit more committees to be called.

The gentleman from New York overlooked one way that the House might consider a bill without the approval of the Rules Committee. I will remind him of it. Suspension of the rules on certain days, but the Speaker is absolute boss as to that. There is no provision in the rules making him recognize anybody. He has the privilege of doing it if he wants to, but he does not have to do it.

Now, gentlemen, the whole purpose of the rules I have prepared is not to deal with a committee that is functioning, not to deal with a committee that is having hearings on bills referred to it, but with a willful committee; one that attempts to strangle in the dark a public bill; one that your constituents and mine are interested in. That is frequently done. They smother them there to keep the House from voting on them and to keep Members from going on record as to how they stand. I will quote what I said in my radio address on this subject. I said committees can kill bills in committee—page 3205—

Under our present code of rules any public bill in which the people are vitally interested can be smothered in a committee and thus killed, and it is most frequently done, and by the same means the membership of the House may be prevented from going on record as to how they stand on the measure. This system of gag rule plays directly into the hands of the special interests and is a favorite method used in preventing legislation opposed by them. I believe that a man or woman elected to the high office of Congressman should have the courage to vote on any public legislation pending in Congress, and to let his constituents, who have a voice on the legislation only through their Representative, know how he stands upon it.

The gentleman from New York admits the criticism. I quote from his speech:

It is very difficult for a man constituted as I am to take the pounding that the chairman of the Rules Committee receives on the floor of the House, when I know the Member is demagoguing. I know it because time and time again he has come to me after he has made a statement and said, "Do not pay any attention to it. I did not mean it, but I was forced into this for political reasons, but for God's sake, you stand up and do what is right."

He admits the charge. He says that when the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee did not do what they should have done, smother that Capper-Kelly bill in the committee, they passed the buck to him, but he was not going to stand for it, so he brought in a rule. I am glad he did. I have been writing my folks for two years that I would not support it and I was delighted to have the privilege of voting against it. But the gentleman admits my case.

Gentlemen, what I am seeking to do is to correct that; to fix the rules so that if 100 Members desire to put the House on record as to an important nonprivileged public bill they will have the right to do so. Your constituents and my constituents have the right to know how we stand, and the only way they have a vote in this Congress is through you as their duly elected Representatives. They have the right to know; yet under present conditions they can not find out unless you voluntarily tell them. The discharge rule I propose is to deal with that situation. Muscle Shoals is tied up in conference and we can not do anything about it. Eighty per cent—and I repeat it—of the Members of this House may desire to act, but unless the Rules Committee brings in a rule dealing with it they can not do it, unless they override the rules of the House. The same would be true of an amendment to the Volstead Act and the submission of the question of the repeal of the eighteenth amendment, dealing with prohibition. Neither is privileged and you can not do it, but if the rule I propose is adopted, 100 Members on two days a month can inaugurate and initiate the procedure, where upon the request of 100 Members the House will be forced to vote as to whether or not it will take up a bill. Oh, no; the 100 Members do not discharge the committee, the 100 Members simply inaugurate and initiate the machinery whereby on two days in each month the majority of the House will have the privilege of voting as to whether a majority of the House desires to discharge a committee, and, if a majority desires to do so, it is discharged. If they do not, then the committee is not discharged. This rule will not clog or interfere with business or tie up legislation. It will not be legislation by petition, because such a motion can not be made until a committee has had an opportunity to consider a bill for 30 days.

I do not believe this House would at any time do the foolish thing but that when 100 Members desired to take up a bill there would be some good reason for it, and that the Members of the House would only act when it was necessary.

I will not have the time to answer the gentleman with regard to the tariff bill. He referred to the fact that they had a conference about the tariff bill, but I remind him that was not the first conference they had on it. They had one long before they reported the first rule in connection with the bill. They did not bring in a rule at once when the bill was reported by the Ways and Means Committee but allowed us to debate it day after day while certain Republicans appeared before these 15 Republican Members who prepared the original bill to see if they could be mollified or pacified in their opposition to the bill if they were permitted to offer some amendments and have them adopted. Then when they got enough satisfied to adopt the rule, in came the steam roller, and she rolled. They adopted the rule and they passed the bill. The gentleman said there were 1,250 amendments placed on the bill by the Senate and that it would have been impossible to permit the House to act on all of them. He said they had a conference. Oh, yes; they had a conference and they had a conference for the same reason. They could not have a rule adopted unless certain Members were given a chance to vote on the tariff on cement, sugar, lumber, the flexible provision, and the debenture. So they had a conference and they agreed to give them separate votes on those propositions and then in came the rule and it was adopted.

Now, much complaint is made concerning the Private Calendar. If we followed the rules of the House, every Friday the House would resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House for the consideration of the Private Calendar. I have not seen that rule applied but once since I have been back here. In the old days it was used, but, of course, at times they were not able to pass as many bills on one Friday as under the present system, because they might get one that was contested and that slowed up things. But that is the rule of the House and it gives everyone a fair and square chance on his bill when it is reached on the calendar.

However, if you are not going to apply that rule it seems to me it would be in the interest of the membership of the House to have a rule adopted which would provide for the consideration of private bills by unanimous consent, and providing that there shall be three objections to the present consideration of the bill, just as we now have it with reference to the Consent Calendar the second time a bill is called up.

Now, gentlemen, I have trespassed upon your time much longer than I anticipated, but I am sure you will admit that the questions asked me have required considerable time. I am in perfectly good humor; I am perfectly sincere; I am making this fight, not for the Democratic side but for the entire membership of the House, to make it again a representative body and to give a majority, irrespective of politics, on two days of the month an opportunity to place the House on record.

The gentleman from New York sees the handwriting on the wall. His speech was the last appeal, the dying appeal, of the old guard for you to rally around him and to retain his power; but the call will go unanswered, for I have not any doubt but that the Seventy-second Congress will liberalize the rules. [Applause.]

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield so that I may obtain some information?

Mr. CRISP. I will be pleased to yield.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I was not here at the beginning of the gentleman's remarks, and perhaps he has already enlightened the House as to the matter I want to inquire about at this time. Something has been said about the congestion of the business of the House if the particular rule the gentleman speaks of were adopted. I understand, if this rule were adopted, the business taken up under the rule would only be considered by the House two days each month; is that correct?

Mr. CRISP. I am very pleased that my friend has asked this question, because on account of the interruptions I did not have a chance to answer it. The rule has two clauses in it. One of them is the old rule I had in the Fifty-eighth Congress, that where a committee is discharged and the bill taken up it is only considered on those particular days, and if it is not finished on the first day it goes over to the next discharge day; but the only bill I have ever seen the discharge rule applied to was the Howell-Barkley bill, and when it got up there was a filibuster, and they filibustered and filibustered, and we remained here one entire night, and I saw then that the rule had to be changed. I have profited by that experience, and the only effective way to have a discharge rule is to make the discharge rule apply against the Committee on Rules, and this is the way it is to be done: I would sit down and introduce a resolution and send it to the Rules Committee providing that upon the adoption of the resolution a certain bill should be considered. I would make that a continuing order. I would say that the House from day to day shall proceed to consider the bill until it is finally disposed of. I would say how many hours of debate there should be. I would cut off all dilatory motions and confine the Speaker to entertaining only one motion to adjourn, and then if 100 Members signed the petition and the Committee on Rules was discharged and it was brought in here and the House adopted the rule, it would have the same force and effect for the consideration of that bill that it would have if the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] brought it in here with a favorable report and it was adopted. It would cut off filibusters, it would make the House continue to consider the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has expired.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman two additional minutes.

Mr. CRISP. When I discussed this matter last Friday, the gentleman from Alabama asked me how the rule would work if they made an adverse report, and I answered that I had not thought of that and I would have to consider it. I thought of it that night and I now have the answer. That is a weakness. If the Rules Committee purposely and

wilfully sought to circumvent the House from acting when they had a resolution for the consideration of a bill by making a favorable report and not calling it up or by making an adverse report, under the rule as I originally drafted it, they might accomplish their purpose. I am going to propose two others that will change that. I am going to propose that if the Committee on Rules makes a favorable report on a rule for the consideration of a bill and they do not call it up within three days, then any member of the Rules Committee, minority or majority, can call it up, and I am going to provide that if they make an adverse report on a rule providing for the consideration of a bill, then on days when it is in order to call the discharge calendar, any Member of the House can call up that adverse report as a privileged matter, and the House does not have to accept the committee's recommendation of an adverse report, but can turn them down; and if a majority adopts the rule, then we will proceed to consider the bill under the terms of the rule, and there is no escape from it. The rule, with these additions which I shall prepare, will work and will prevent a filibuster, if a majority of the House desires to act.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia has again expired.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman three additional minutes.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Will the gentleman yield for a further question?

Mr. CRISP. I will be delighted to yield to the gentleman.

Mr. WOODRUFF. I infer from what the gentleman has just stated that this discharge rule could not be invoked against the standing legislative committees of the House.

Mr. CRISP. Not unless the bill had been before them 30 days. In that case, it could.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Does not the gentleman realize that at the beginning of a session a large number of bills are introduced in the House and referred to the appropriate committees, and frequently it is not possible for any legislative committee to give consideration to a bill believed to be very important by some Member other than a member of the committee, and it is not given consideration unless some pressure is brought to bear upon the committee. I am sure the gentleman realizes that I am one of the liberal-minded men of the House, but I like to see orderly procedure, and being a member of a legislative committee, it seems to me that the members of the various committees ought to have a fair opportunity to consider any bill that is proposed to be brought up under this rule, before it is actually brought up. My friend realizes the futility of trying to legislate in the Committee of the Whole, and the thought I have is that before that is undertaken, every opportunity should be given to the proper legislative committee to function in connection with the bill for which the rule is invoked.

Mr. CRISP. I agree with my friend, but the rule gives them 30 days plus 7 days before it is put on the calendar, and I think that gives them a fair amount of time. The rule is not intended to be applied to ordinary bills. It is only applicable to outstanding public bills, and the rule will not destroy the Rules Committee, as they fear. It will make the Rules Committee good.

It will make the Rules Committee subservient to the wishes of the majority of the House. Probably the rule would not be used often because they would probably report a rule when a hundred Members were interested in it.

Mr. WOODRUFF. Might I suggest to my friend that it would be fair to give the legislative committees a longer period of time before the motion to discharge was actually made in which to consider a bill before the rule was invoked? It seems to me that this would make for much better legislation.

Mr. CRISP. I do not arrogate to myself superior knowledge—that is a matter of detail, when the rule is up for consideration the majority can say whether it should be increased or not.

Mr. WOODRUFF. These bills that would be considered under the discharge rule would be bills of considerable import.

Mr. CRISP. Undoubtedly.

Mr. WOODRUFF. It seems to me unreasonable to expect a legislative committee to act promptly because of the necessary hearings that should be held in matters of legislation. The witnesses may have to come from the far ends of the country. The subject under consideration would probably be of considerable importance and it is not only possible but probable that extended hearings should be held by the committee before sufficient information could be secured upon which to legislate intelligently.

Mr. CRISP. If the committee was having hearings, legitimately considering the bill, you could not get 10 Members to sign a petition for discharge.

Mr. WOODRUFF. And further, the committees do not always select for first consideration bills that might strike some Member as being most important. Bills before committees are usually considered in the order of priority importance as suggested by the departments affected by the bills. It seems to me in view of what I have said that the gentleman from Georgia should add considerable time to the seven days which, under his proposed bill, may elapse before the bill is taken from the committee.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER] 40 minutes.

EXTRA SESSION OF CONGRESS

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, my following the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] is a coincidence. I had intended to get into the general debate when the legislative appropriation bill was up last Saturday but did not have the time as I was occupied in committee hearing before the Ways and Means Committee on the proposals to cash the World War veterans' certificates.

I wish this afternoon to make some observations on the state of the Union, running all the way from the talk of an extra session, through some pending legislation, and then give some attention to the agitation for change in the rules of the House.

In view of the fact that the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] preceded me with a discussion on the House rules, I may devote more time to that subject than I had intended.

First let us dispose of the talk of the need of an extra session of Congress. The President of the United States before this session of Congress convened last December, if the press quoted him correctly, wanted, if possible, to avoid an extra session. I do not know what his attitude is now. I presume he is no more enthusiastic for an extra session now than he was then.

During the last few months I have been reading some interesting histories touching the Civil War period and the reconstruction days following the Civil War.

Lincoln, during the Civil War, never did have the hearty support of Congress. He had Thad Stevens here in the House and Senator Sumner and Senator Wade in the Senate criticizing him constantly. Everything he did was criticized in Congress. He had much opposition in Congress. He was denounced as a usurper. His selection of generals, his conduct of the war, his attitude toward the States in rebellion were all subjects of condemnation. Even his Gettysburg speech, according to some critics of that day, was disappointing and inferior for the occasion.

Mr. BECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. BECK. Will the gentleman gratify my curiosity by saying who it was that said that the Gettysburg speech was unworthy of the occasion?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I said some critics of that time. Everett's speech was considered the great speech of the day, but there was not much comment or praise at that time of Lincoln's Gettysburg speech.

Mr. BECK. I was curious to know the name. I thought I had missed it.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I did not give any name.

There were disturbing elements in Congress during Lincoln's time as there are now. I have before me a History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850, by J. F.

Rhodes. In volume 5, pages 137-138, there is an interesting account of the last meeting that Mr. Lincoln had with his Cabinet on the morning of April 14, 1865. You know President Lincoln was assassinated that evening. I shall have this whole paragraph printed in the extension of my remarks. In this paragraph President Lincoln related a dream which he had the night before. He spoke in complimentary terms of General Lee and others of the Confederacy and manifested enthusiasm over the establishment of government in Virginia. The sentences I shall read at this place express the feeling of relief and gratification on the part of President Lincoln that he did not have Congress on his hands at the time. Some of you may see how these sentences apply to the situation before us. I now quote President Lincoln:

I think it providential that this great rebellion is crushed just as Congress has adjourned and there are none of the disturbing elements of that body to hinder and embarrass us. If we are wise and discreet, we shall reanimate the States and get their governments in successful operation, with order prevailing and the Union reestablished, before Congress comes together in December.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman state whether he approves of the method by which those State governments were put into operation?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Oh, I can not go into that. Of course, Mr. Lincoln's position all the time during the war was that the Southern States were not out of the Union; that they were still a part of the Union. His critics in Congress contended the States in rebellion had taken themselves out of the Union, and after Lincoln's death they proceeded to enact the reconstruction acts contrary to Lincoln's views. It would have been much better if Lincoln's views had prevailed. But that is taking me away from my subject.

Mr. PARKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. PARKS. There is nobody who lives in the South that did not deplore the fact that Lincoln's policy was not carried out.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I understand that. I was quoting from Lincoln for another purpose. I do not know whether the President of the United States has any feeling akin to those of Mr. Lincoln toward Congress now or not, but certainly a lot of things can be done and should be done that the President can do and take care of during the nine months following March 4 better without Congress on his hands than with Congress on his hands.

Next, is there any considerable group in the United States that is demanding an extra session of Congress? Let us turn to the farmers. I have in my hand here the American Farm Bureau Weekly News Letter of December 30, 1930. On page 2 there is an article headed "Extra session not seen necessary for farmers." I now read the first paragraph from that article:

Farmers are not expecting an extra session to be necessary following March 4, 1931. Much of the legislation in which they are interested at Washington classifies as unfinished business, and if, in the ensuing two months, Congress works with that speed which may be expected of it and which it usually manifests, they will have secured the final enactment of all or at least most of the bills in which agriculture is interested.

That is the first paragraph. Then follows a list of 16 bills in which the farmers are interested. The legislative committee of the American Farm Bureau Federation assured me that this article correctly sets forth the attitude of their organization. These bills are regarded of minor importance, as the last paragraph of the article will show. I read the last paragraph of the article:

None of these bills will bring in the agricultural millenium, as each one is more of a minor than a major legislation project. However, altogether they constitute a rather large legislative program which, when enacted, will be beneficial to agriculture.

I believe this view is held by the other great agricultural associations and by the farmers generally of the country.

I have heretofore had occasion to present my views on our economic system. There are wrongs in our economic system that not only should be corrected but must be corrected if

our social and economic order is to survive. We have a surplus of food, of clothing, of fuel, and of material for housing on the one hand. On the other hand we have millions of people able, willing, and anxious to work who are suffering because of a lack of food, of clothing, of fuel, and of material for housing. The existence of such a situation no one can or will justify. During the last year I followed with interest the proceedings of the great labor organizations of the country. I was looking especially to these labor gatherings for suggestions for legislation to correct the situation that confronts us. I have not read the minutes of the proceedings of these labor organizations. So far as I could get their attitude from newspaper reports, it is that the problem of unemployment and the more equitable distribution of the fruits of industry is largely for the employers and employees to work out. I have before me an interview given out by Mr. Matthew Woll, vice president of the American Federation of Labor, which was printed in the Washington Sunday Star, December 7 last. I read just one paragraph from this interview, which I think reflects the attitude of the great labor organizations of the country. It is as follows:

Probably the machinery for recording unemployment will have to be provided by legislation. But we do not favor legislation to force compliance of industry. Organized labor has made voluntary principles the cornerstone of its philosophy. Government can not control industry.

There is no group in either the House or the Senate that has a legislative program which goes to the fundamentals of our economic ills. The President of the United States, in his annual message to Congress last December, outlined his program which he asked Congress to enact into legislation. The President's program can be easily enacted into legislation before March 4. The President also made suggestions for studies to be made by committees of Congress during the time Congress should stand in adjournment from March 4 until the first Monday in December. These studies should be made. In regard to the economic depression, the President in his message, on page 2, among other suggestions, said:

Economic depression can not be cured by legislative action or Executive pronouncement. Economic wounds must be healed by the action of the cells of the economic body—the producers and the consumers themselves.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. Is it not true that the American Federation of Labor officials, in executive session in Miami, went on record as against an extra session of Congress?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I did not see that. Does the gentleman say that is the fact?

Mr. MORGAN. I saw some such publicity.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I did not see that. So far as I know there is not a group of any kind, farm, business, industrial, or labor, that thinks it is necessary for Congress to be in extra session for the purpose of enacting legislation to aid economic recovery.

The question naturally presents itself whether the economic recovery which the President has in mind can be expedited better by Congress being in session or by Congress taking the usual adjournment which comes between sessions of Congress in the odd-numbered years.

LEGISLATIVE PROPOSALS

I shall now take up some legislative proposals that have been suggested that this Congress should pass as the price of avoiding an extra session of Congress. The threat has been made that unless these proposals are enacted into law that an extra session will be forced. Of course, the only place where an extra session of Congress can be forced is in the Senate, where the Senate rules make it possible for a minority to filibuster against appropriation bills the enactment of which is necessary for the Government to function. None of the proposals which have been put forth go to the substance of things. None of them go to the foundation of our economic ills. I shall now consider these legislative proposals.

First. Lame-duck amendment: I was one of the first Members of the House to introduce a resolution following the World War to do away with the so-called lame-duck sessions of Congress. I supported the resolution that was before the House during the last Congress. That resolution was thoroughly and ably discussed in the House. It failed to get the necessary two-thirds vote. I am ready to support such a resolution again if it is in proper form. Amending the Constitution in the way suggested, however, would not solve or help to solve our economic difficulties. Our present system has not caused any particular hardships or wrongs to the people. To amend the Constitution in the form proposed I do not think will hasten the days of economic reform and economic justice. I have favored the resolution for the reason that in my opinion to permit the newly elected Members of Congress to meet and to take charge of the enactment of legislation at an earlier date is more in line with the principles of political science. I shall not discuss this proposal further at this time, because I hope at an early date to get time to discuss Constitution amending, and at that time shall give consideration to the particular form of the proposed amendment to do away with our short sessions of Congress.

Second. Anti-injunction bill. This is another bill that is urged as the price of avoiding an extra session of Congress. My view is that the powers of the Federal courts in issuing injunctions in labor disputes should be redefined and curtailed. Occasionally a Federal court does issue unconscionable injunctions against laborers. I do not know that there is any possibility of considering this bill at this session. A bill on the subject was adversely reported in the Senate and the House Judiciary Committee has not yet reported on the bill. Both political parties in their national platforms in 1928 went on record favoring the curbing of the powers of the Federal courts in this regard. I think it is the duty of the House Judiciary Committee to give this matter consideration and to report out some kind of a bill during this session of Congress.

Third. The so-called Wagner bills. Gentlemen occasionally get up on the floor of this House and speak as though nothing has been done in the consideration of these bills. The bill providing for getting statistics on unemployment was passed at the last session of Congress. The Labor Department now has an appropriation to carry out the purposes of this law. The advance planning bill has passed both the Senate and the House, and is probably at this moment on its way to the White House. The advance planning bill, if enacted into law, is not going to affect our present economic situation. The revolving fund provided for in this bill is \$150,000,000. Already upon the recommendation of the President for this year Congress has authorized the expenditure of \$750,000,000 for public works of different kinds. That is about \$500,000,000 more than we have been spending in normal years. On account of the existing emergency and because of the prompt action of the President as soon as the country was involved in the economic depression, we are doing a great deal more this year than we could do under this advanced planning bill.

The other Wagner bill is for the coordination of the State employment bureaus. This bill has passed the Senate, has been reported out by the House Judiciary Committee, and is now on the Union Calendar awaiting the action of this House. I have favored all three of these bills.

Fourth. The fourth proposal is the Muscle Shoals bill, which the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] has again referred to. That is in conference. A month or so ago gentlemen from the South were demanding that the House conferees sign a conference report of disagreement so the matter could come before the House for action. A week or two ago the House conferees unanimously agreed to report a disagreement. The reason why this proposal has not been before the House on disagreement is because the Senate conferees refused to join the House conferees in reporting a disagreement. Personally, I am very anxious that this Muscle Shoals controversy should be disposed of, but it

should be disposed of in a manner that will preserve the rights of the Government to explosives in time of war and the rights of farmers to fertilizers in time of peace. The surplus electric power should be sold by the Government, but certainly no thoughtful Member of this House wants to put the Government in the business of distributing electric power.

Fifth. The farm debenture plan. I discussed this proposal at some length before the House on April 30 last. I shall not undertake at this time to go into the merits or demerits of this proposal. The plan that was before the House was indefensible from the standpoint of the farmers. However, my view or the individual views of Members of the House or Senate are not of controlling importance at this time. The question now is: Do the farmers want Congress at this session or at an extra session of Congress to enact an export debenture law? The leaders of the various farm organizations met the latter part of last November with the Senate Agricultural Committee, of which Senator McNARY is chairman.

The farm leaders all agreed that they wanted to give the farm marketing act a further trial. They did not want any interference with the operations of the Federal Farm Board. They wanted this law to be given further trial until at least in December, 1931. They were not asking for any equalization fee or debenture legislation or anything else along that line.

Mr. Taber, the president of the National Grange, whose organization has sponsored the export-debenture plan, when asked by the press the attitude of the Grange on the debenture, stated that he was still for the debenture, but that he realized that it was impossible to get the debenture through the short session of Congress, and that an extra session of Congress would cost more than the debenture was worth.

This attitude of the leaders of the farm organizations ought to have weight with the thinking Members of Congress.

Sixth. Appropriations for food: At this time I have no intention to get into the controversy now raging between the White House and Capitol Hill on this subject. This proposal ought to be faced calmly, judicially, and dispassionately. Everyone knows that the President of the United States has had more experience in relieving human hunger and suffering than any other man in the history of mankind. His plan of relieving human hunger and distress in the drought-stricken States of the United States is through the American Red Cross. The Red Cross is the only organization now in existence that has made and can make a survey of the situation in the drought-stricken areas. No committee of Congress has undertaken to make such a survey. The President and the Red Cross are agreed as to the method that should be pursued to relieve the men, women, and children in the drought-stricken areas of the country.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Not now. I do not want to be discourteous, but I would like to finish my statement. The Red Cross officials say they have funds on hand to relieve all the hunger and distress in the drought-stricken regions of the United States. They are undertaking to raise more funds. They have a trust fund of between forty and fifty million dollars, which they do not want to use in case they can raise the additional necessary funds. But, if necessary, every cent of that money in the trust fund is pledged to carry out the task they have undertaken.

I do not want to be understood as criticizing Members of Congress who have taken the attitude of opposition to the President and the Red Cross. I am willing to concede that the desire of such Members to relieve human suffering is just as great as the desire of the President to do so.

The attempts of Members to give the impression to the country that their hearts beat more in sympathy with human suffering than does the heart of the President, of course, will be futile. The country knows the President's knowledge of and his experience in relieving human hunger and suffering, not only in this country but also in other

countries. The people of the country know that the President's knowledge and experience along this line is many times greater than the combined knowledge and experience of all the Members of Congress. The people of the country have absolute confidence that the President and the Red Cross intend to and will take care of every case of suffering in the drought-stricken areas. The people know that the President and the Red Cross, together with the local committees in the cities where unemployment prevails, will take care of the situation and that we will pass through this distressful winter with a minimum of human suffering and human hunger.

Mr. McKEOWN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. The President appointed various commissions or committees all over the several drought-stricken States, and those committees reported to him in October or November. Does the gentleman think the President accepted the reports of these commissions he appointed?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I do not know the contents of those reports, but I do know that the Red Cross, together with other agencies under Mr. Woods, have made surveys, and undoubtedly those surveys have been submitted to the President and the President is acting on them.

In the field of human relief the President stands out pre-eminently above not only any person in the United States but above any person in the world, and naturally I have a great deal of respect for and confidence in the President's judgment in matters of that kind. I believe most Members of Congress feel the same as I do on this subject.

Mr. McKEOWN. The gentleman knows that the President has just issued a statement to the press in connection with that matter?

Mr. RAMSEYER. No; I do not know that.

Mr. McKEOWN. He just issued a statement giving his position.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I have not seen the statement and therefore could not intelligently discuss the contents of the statement with the gentleman. If the gentleman will kindly excuse me, I will now undertake to make some observations in regard to the rules of the House.

CHANGES IN HOUSE RULES

I shall now make some observations on the rules of the House. For four years I was a member of the Rules Committee. Under the Republican conference rules when I became a member of the Ways and Means Committee I had to resign from the Committee on Rules. A majority of the House of Representatives of course has the right to adopt any rules governing the proceedings of this body. It is quite generally conceded that in the first session of the next Congress, after the Speaker is elected and the organization of the House completed, full opportunity will be afforded to all Members of the House to present amendments or changes to the existing rules of the House. My advice to those who favor changes in the rules of the House is to first familiarize themselves with the existing rules, study the history of the rules, the reasons for the different rules, then be sure that the changes proposed will expedite orderly legislation and not retard it.

The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] has proposed a few changes in the rules which he thinks are of great importance. He just got through presenting another argument in support of his position. In the speech he just made he insists, as he has in other speeches, that he is always fair, but to be frank I must state that I do not think that those who listen to him always get that impression. Before I go farther I want it to be clearly understood that there are places, in my judgment, where the rules of the House should be changed. The rule that has been most in controversy during the last 20 years is the rule empowering the House to discharge a committee from further consideration of a bill and thereby force the bill out of the hands of the committee into the House for consideration. Such a rule was first adopted by the Democrats in 1911.

That rule never did work and according to the opinion of some was probably so drawn that it would not work. This

rule continued a part of the rules of the House until 1924, when a more liberal discharge rule was adopted. When this matter was up for consideration before the House of Representatives in January, 1924, I presented a rule to discharge committees which I regarded as the most liberal discharge rule ever offered. The conservatives of the House on both sides were opposed to it because it would work. The radicals on both sides were opposed to it either because they were committed to their own particular plan or because they did not comprehend the liberality of my proposal.

You can find the rule that I proposed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for January 18, 1924, page 1122. Following my proposal is the debate that followed the presentation of my amendment to the rules.

The gentleman from Georgia in presenting the two changes to the rules makes a scathing denunciation of all the rules of the House. In reading his radio speech, which was printed in the RECORD of Monday, January 26, one gets the impression, and I am sure the people who heard him over the radio got the impression, that the iniquity of the present rules of the House, from the standpoint of the gentleman from Georgia, is something of recent origin. The denunciation is not against a few rules that need amendment but against the "present gag system," thereby denouncing the whole system of rules. At another place he condemns all the rules of the House by referring to them as "our archaic rules." When he is pinned down he admits that there are only a few rules in his opinion that need changes, and that if his two suggested changes were adopted the whole system of rules would be transformed from archaic to modern. But that is not what he conveyed to his radio audience.

Permit me to state that after considerable study of the history of the procedure and rules of the House and being familiar with the rules that were in force when the Democrats were in power and the rules that have been in operation since the Republicans have been in power, that the rules of the House to-day are more liberal than they were during the eight years of Democratic control, from 1911 to 1919. [Applause.]

The gentleman from Georgia called attention to a colloquy between Mr. CAMPBELL, chairman of the Rules Committee in 1922, and other Members of the House concerning the practice of the chairman of the Rules Committee carrying rules in his pocket and refusing to present them to the House. During the four years I was in the House of Representatives when the Democrats were in control, the chairman of the Rules Committee could do and did do frequently that very thing. When the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] became chairman of the Rules Committee, one of the first reforms he inaugurated was to do away with the pocketing of the rules by the chairman of the Rules Committee. Under the present rules, a rule reported out by the Rules Committee must go on the House Calendar and can not be called up the same day it is reported except under suspension of the rules. Furthermore, the rules of the House were further amended and liberalized so that if the chairman of the Rules Committee fails to call up the rule on the House Calendar within a reasonable time, the majority of the Rules Committee can direct another member of the Rules Committee to call up such a rule. All of this liberalization was brought about by the Republicans since they came into power. Placing a reported rule on the House Calendar before it can be called up gives all Members of the House an opportunity to become familiar with the rule before it is called up for consideration. Certainly these changes governing the Rules Committee are a great improvement and advance over the system which was in vogue when the House was in the control of the Democratic Party.

I do not know of a single rule that we operate under now that is less liberal than when the Democrats were in control. The rule for consent Mondays, the Calendar Wednesday rule, and the rule taking from the Speaker the power to appoint committees and to be chairman of the Rules Committee were all adopted before the Democrats came into power in the spring of 1911.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I yield.

Mr. CRISP. I am sure the gentleman wants to be correct. The first time this House ever elected the committees and the committees were not appointed by the Speaker was when Mr. Clark was Speaker and the Democrats in power.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The gentleman knows that it was in March, 1910, that the fight was made by Mr. NORRIS, of Nebraska, to change the rules so as to deprive the Speaker of the power to appoint the committees of the House and to be chairman of the Rules Committee. Why does the gentleman want to give the impression that that rule was changed after the Democrats came into power, and no one could draw any other inference from the statement the gentleman just made?

Mr. CRISP. I repeat that the first time the House ever elected its committees was under the Clark administration.

Mr. RAMSEYER. But it was under a rule adopted under a Republican administration.

Mr. CRISP. Oh, my friend forgets that the Constitution of the United States says that each Congress shall adopt its own rules, and the Democrats in that Congress adopted their rules, and that was the first time committees were ever elected in that way.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes; that is one time the Democrats showed some sense in following the Republicans in adopting the Republican rules of a previous Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. CRISP. May I ask the gentleman another question? I do not want to inconvenience the gentleman.

Mr. RAMSEYER. If it is on the point I am discussing, I shall be pleased to yield.

Mr. CRISP. It is right on the point the gentleman is discussing. The gentleman said the rules are more liberal now than they were when the Democrats were in power.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I stated that I did not know of a rule that we have now that is less liberal than it was when the Democrats were in power. But go ahead; I probably stated it both ways.

Mr. CRISP. I may have misunderstood the gentleman, but I thought he said they are more liberal now. There are two changes only, and one is that a bill on the Consent Calendar requires three objections when it is called the second time, and the other is the rule requiring reports of the Committee on Rules to go on the calendar. Can my friend name a single other change?

Mr. RAMSEYER. That was accomplished in six years. Can my friend from Georgia point out like progress that the Democrats made in the eight years they were in power? [Applause.]

Mr. CRISP. I can.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The gentleman can not. I know what the rules of the House were when I first came here as a Member and what they are now. Let us be fair about it.

Now, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] made a speech over the radio on Saturday night a week ago, and I presume he intended to be fair. I read that speech Tuesday morning after it was printed in the RECORD. I want to be fair with the gentleman from Georgia, but I also want to be frank with Members of the House. After reading that speech carefully I came to the conclusion that the speech was unfair and inaccurate throughout.

I am going to read one of the least offending of his statements which is in the third from the last paragraph:

"Under the present code of rules"—mind you, code of rules. That means all the rules, not two or three. There are 43 House rules and the forty-third rule says:

The rules of parliamentary practice comprised in Jefferson's Manual shall govern the House in all cases to which they are applicable, and in which they are not inconsistent with the standing rules and orders of the House and joint rules of the Senate and House of Representatives.

There are 53 sections in Jefferson's Manual and most sections have a number of paragraphs.

Now, the fair thing to do when you indict the rules of the House, if you do not mean to change every rule of the House, is to go through them and point out which ones of the 43 rules of the House should be changed and which ones

of the 53 sections of Jefferson's Manual should be changed. It is not fair to get up here, or before a microphone, and speak of a gag system and the archaic rules of the House if you can only find fault with two or three rules. The only inference that people over the radio, who do not understand the rules of the House, can possibly get from the gentleman's radio speech is that every rule from the first to the last should be condemned. If you want to be fair, why not state that rule so-and-so should be changed and that the rule for the discharge of committees should be changed, but the other rules, on the whole, have worked well and are good, and that you are not seeking any change in them, and that, in fact, they are rules that both Democrats and Republicans have worked under, and no considerable number on either side is seeking any change in them.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes; certainly.

Mr. CRISP. I stated expressly in that radio speech, in the last paragraph, that I thought the rules of the House as a whole were good, that they had to be construed as a whole, and if there were any weakness in them the whole code fell. I said in that address that with the changes I proposed, and there were only three or four that I discussed, I thought it would be a good code of rules for the House. This statement is in that radio address.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The gentleman at the end of his speech does make a guarded statement on that, but all the way through his speech he condemned the system—all the rules—so that people listening could not get any other impression than that the rules of the House from beginning to end were bad and designed to block legislation. [Applause.]

I started to read:

Under our present code of rules—

Code of rules, mind you—

Under our present code of rules the Rules Committee is in supreme control, the dictator as to what measures the House shall be permitted to consider.

Now, if that is a correct and true statement, then you could not get anything through the House unless the Rules Committee first gave its consent. I called up the Clerk of the House on Tuesday morning, which was the same morning I read this speech, and I asked him how many public bills and resolutions had passed this Congress.

Here they are. Public laws, 546; public resolutions, 106; private laws and resolutions, 281; making a total of 927. It is not disputed that the Rules Committee in all this time only reported out 22 rules to aid legislation. So you subtract 22 from the number I gave you and you will see that all the rest, the great mass of legislation, passed this House under the general rules of the House without the aid or advice or consent of the Rules Committee. I repeat, the speech throughout is unfair and inaccurate.

Now, the gentleman from Georgia—mind you, he is talking to a radio audience, and not one in a thousand listening knows anything about the rules of the House of Representatives—he starts that speech by saying, "Under our archaic rules the House ceases to be a legislative body."

When, I ask him, was the House a representative body, if we now have rules at least as liberal as we ever had in the history of the country?

Archaic means ancient. In the sense of being ancient the Ten Commandments are archaic and so the Constitution of the United States is more ancient than the rules of the House. Archaic may also mean antiquated or obsolescent. Now, if the gentleman had said obsolescent or antiquated, then he would have probably said what he wanted the country to understand him to say about the House rules.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. HOLADAY. I yield the gentleman 10 minutes more.

Mr. RAMSEYER. The gentleman from Georgia states the House no longer represents the people back home. I have already demonstrated that the present House rules are more liberal than any rules the House has ever had. Now, understand me, that does not argue that the House rules can not

be improved or should not be improved. In my opinion they can and should be improved. Because the House rules can and should be improved in a few respects does not justify any gentleman in making a sweeping denunciation of all the rules. There are no rules governing any legislative body or any deliberative body that do not limit the freedom of Members to offer amendments and talk as and when they please. Rules are adopted to preserve the rights equally of all Members and to carry forward the purposes of the legislative organization. The purpose of a legislative assembly is legislation for the welfare of the people. Is there any Member of the House who wants to abolish the 5-minute rule in the Committee of the Whole, the hour rule of debate in the House, the rule for the suspension of rules, the rule for the previous question, the rule of germaneness in offering amendments, and other rules that are familiar to the Members? All these rules limit the freedom of Members. All these rules could be denounced as gag rules. In considering changes in the rules of the House, Members should be governed by this wise saying of Holy Writ: "Prove all things; hold fast that which is good."

I wish I had time to go through the whole radio speech of the gentleman from Georgia and point out its many inconsistencies, inaccuracies, and its unfairness. He denounces the Speaker, the floor leader, and the chairman of the Rules Committee. But I do not care to give heed to what he says about these gentlemen.

He refers in his speech to the passage of the Smoot-Hawley tariff bill. In my speech of March 24, 1930, on the politics of tariff making, I pointed out the shortcomings of the practices of both political parties in framing and passing tariff bills. I gave the facts. I did not condemn the Democratic practice and by inference try to convey to the country that the Republican practice was perfect. The practice of neither party in considering and passing tariff legislation has anything on the other. The gentleman from Georgia refers to the fact that on the conference report of the last tariff bill the House was limited to votes on seven amendments. I assert that when the conference report on the Underwood tariff bill was before the House of Representatives the membership of this House then did not have a separate vote on any amendment.

Mr. CRISP. When we considered the Underwood bill the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Mann, offered 140 amendments to that bill.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Gentlemen, listen. The gentleman from Georgia was present when I delivered my speech on the politics of tariff making and heard me say, and everybody here knows, that the Democratic Party caucus on the Underwood tariff bill had bound every Democratic Representative to vote against every amendment offered from the Republican side, whether it was a good amendment or not.

Now, everybody knows when the last tariff bill was up it was considered under a rule limiting the offering of amendments to the Committee on Ways and Means. Now, frankly, I think that limits the Members too much. That method, however, had the approval of the Republicans of the House, with few exceptions. The Democratic method permitted Republicans more freedom in offering amendments but absolutely bound Democrats to vote against such amendments, whether right or wrong. I think that the Democratic practice is more unconscionable and more to be condemned and less frank and open than the practice of the Republicans. [Applause.]

The gentleman in his radio speech and other speeches that he has made on the subject seems to be unconscious that he or his party have now or ever have had any shortcomings. In his radio speech, in his speech here to-day, and in the inquiries he has addressed to me the only inference you can get from those inquiries and his speeches is that the Democratic Party never committed a wrong.

Mr. CRISP. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. CRISP. Of course, I admit that the Democrats have made mistakes.

Mr. RAMSEYER. This is the first time I ever heard the gentleman admit it.

Mr. CRISP. Then the gentleman did not want to hear it. I said I favor this rule whether my party does or not. Answering the gentleman's suggestion about the caucus of my party, I have no objection to a party in conference or caucus agreeing to stand to a certain position and presenting its position to the country and letting the country pass upon it, weigh it, and if it does not approve it, condemn it. The minority does have the right and should have the right to offer amendments and present its case to the country; and under the Democratic consideration of the Underwood tariff bill that right was given the minority.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes; and that was a farce, and the gentleman knows it; and while the method that we Republicans pursued may not be entitled to a great deal of praise, at least it was not farcical and hypocritical.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAMSEYER. Yes.

Mr. MAPES. In other words, the Democratic system is to have a secret caucus and to proceed in a secret way, while the Republicans act in the open.

Mr. RAMSEYER. That is another way to put it. And so all the way through. No one can read this radio speech without reluctantly coming to the conclusion that it is saturated from beginning to end with partisan bias. Remember, I am not against changes of the rules, but I do object to a gentleman getting up here day after day and getting out on the radio and conveying the impression to the country that he is the simon-pure representative of an absolutely simon-pure party, while the other fellows are responsible for all legislative shortcomings. That is the conclusion that it was intended to convey to the radio listeners who are unfamiliar with the rules of the House.

Let us get now to this discharge rule. Of course, the Democratic discharge rule, and I think the gentleman from Georgia has already admitted that, was the only innovation that the Democrats made to the rules when they came into power in 1911. I think they did change the Calendar Wednesday rule a little bit.

Mr. CRISP. And, if the gentleman will permit, I am not sure about this, but I think they established the Consent Calendar, to take away from the Speaker the right to exercise his discretion in recognizing for unanimous consent, but I am not sure about that.

Mr. RAMSEYER. I am sure about that, and the gentleman is wrong. Consent Calendar and Calendar Wednesday were recognized and established by change in the rules in 1909. He admits that when the Democrats came into power they found such perfect Republican rules that they could only change them in one little detail, by a minor amendment to the Calendar Wednesday rule, and they added a discharge rule that never worked and never was intended to work, and at a time when the gentleman from Georgia was the parliamentary clerk of the House. Is it not a proper inference that he himself wrote the rule, and that he himself knew exactly what he was doing when he wrote the rule, and that he knew that it would never operate?

Mr. CRISP. May I just answer that and say that I had nothing to do with the preparation of the rule?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa has expired.

Mr. SIMMONS. I yield the gentleman 10 minutes additional.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Then the gentleman from Georgia was not shown as much confidence and courtesy as we show our present parliamentary clerk, because I know we would not attempt an important change in the rules without consulting our present parliamentary clerk. When the Republicans came into power in 1919 they held onto the discharge rule of the Democrats—this iniquitous rule that would not work.

In 1923, in December, we decided to liberalize the discharge rule, and we debated for a week upon the question in January, 1924. Remember, we had about the same rules then as we have now. The rules were thrown wide open for amend-

ment. The practice is—and this practice prevailed in the last 20 years save once under the Republicans in December, 1923—for the chairman of the Committee on Rules at the beginning of a new Congress to get up and move that the rules of the last Congress be made the rules of the coming Congress, and then the previous question is moved. That is exactly what the Democrats did each time they were in power. The Democrats carried the previous question and put over the rules. The Republicans have done exactly the same thing when they have been in power, except in 1923, when it was agreed after the organization was perfected that time should be given later to a consideration of amendments to the rules. I think we adopted the rules temporarily, and then in January, 1924, the rules were thrown open for amendment, and we debated the matter here for a number of days. The only thing that came out of that was a new discharge rule. It was only put into operation once, and that was on the Howell-Barkley bill, during the short session of Congress. Let me call to your attention a little of the history of the Howell-Barkley bill controversy. The railroad labor men came to Washington at the beginning of that short session of Congress. That bill was introduced and referred to the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce. The committee was busy with the consideration of other bills and did not get around to considering the Howell-Barkley bill. This new discharge rule was invoked. The bill was called from the committee. The gentleman from Georgia says that you could not get 100 men to sign a petition until the committee was given an opportunity to consider it. I think I am correct when I state that the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee did not have time to consider the Howell-Barkley bill when a petition to discharge the committee was signed by 150 Members of the House. The motion to discharge the committee was considered for several Mondays and by vote of the House the committee was finally discharged but no further action was taken thereon. Now, then, what happened? In the next Congress the railroad employees and the railroad managers got together and agreed on a bill. That bill passed the House and Senate almost unanimously and was signed by the President. That bill was satisfactory all around to the employees, to the managers, and to the public. The blocking of the Howell-Barkley bill at the short session of Congress gave opportunity for full consideration of the proposal and time to permit the two groups, the employees on the one hand and the managers on the other, to get together and agree on legislation that was of mutual interest and benefit to both sides.

Mr. Richberg, an attorney of Chicago, representing the labor men, sat down with the men, the managers, and the committee, and probably had more to do with writing or rewriting that bill than any other one person. Mr. Winslow, the chairman of the committee, who fought the move to discharge his committee from consideration of the bill, is now chairman of the Mediation Board and giving all-around satisfaction as a member of that board to railway employees, railway managers, and the public. The way this whole dispute was finally settled with satisfaction to all justified the fight made at the time against discharging the committee from further consideration of the bill.

It frequently is the part of wisdom when new and unconsidered legislation is urged, to stop, look, and listen, rather than to rush in and accept ill-considered legislation that has not been fully and carefully gone over and considered by the groups vitally interested therein and by the public, which has concern in all legislation.

Now, before I close, I want to admonish all Members of the House to familiarize themselves with the rules of the House; to get at the reasons for the rules and how the rules were evolved. If after becoming familiar with them you are convinced that changes should be made therein, then at the next session of Congress feel perfectly free to offer your amendments and suggestions. I am sure that every Member of the House will be glad to listen to what you have to offer.

Remember this, that the rules of the House are a means to an end. The rules furnish an orderly means to bring

about necessary and just legislation. The rules of the House are the vehicle on which to carry legislative proposals for careful consideration through committees and through the House.

Another way to judge the rules of the House is to look back over a period of, let us say 10 years, and count the worth-while legislative proposals that were unduly retarded or blocked either under the general rules of the House or by action or nonaction of the Committee on Rules. Since the World War what legislative proposals sponsored by the farm organizations of the country failed to get consideration in the House of Representatives? What legislative proposals sponsored by the labor organizations of the country failed to get consideration in the House of Representatives? The same question can be asked of legislative proposals sponsored by the veterans' organizations. If you are uncertain as to the answers, then consult members of committees who have in charge the consideration of legislative proposals affecting farmers, laborers, and veterans. I know during the four years I was a member of the Rules Committee every request for a special rule by the committees of the House was always given careful and sympathetic consideration by the Rules Committee. Undoubtedly that is still the practice of the Rules Committee.

More important than suggestions for amendments to the rules of the House are remedies to apply to the economic and social conditions of the country. It is more important that you study out remedies for the economic ills of the country than it is that you bring about some changes in the rules of the procedure in the House of Representatives. It is better to consider legislation a year longer and get good legislation than it is to get hasty legislation that may turn out to be bad legislation.

As an aid to the newer Members to get an understanding of the history and procedure of the House of Representatives, and which will give you a better understanding of the reasons underlying the present rules of the House, I am going to recommend to you a book entitled "History and Procedure of the House of Representatives," by De Alva Stanwood Alexander. This book came out in 1916. The author had been a former Member of the House of Representatives. I read this book soon after it came off the press. It gave me a better understanding of the procedure and rules of the House. This book can be gotten from the Library of Congress.

I do not want to dampen any Member's enthusiasm to bring about changes in the rules. I merely am attempting to caution you to study the rules, so you will clearly understand the effect of the changes that you or some other Member may propose. After you have studied the rules and formed a mature judgment as to what changes you want, then it is not only your right but your duty to get up on the floor of this House and advocate your proposals with intelligence and courage.

Of course, I do not object to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CRISP] advocating his changes. He has a perfect right to do so. The fault I find with the gentleman from Georgia is that, in my way of looking at it, he does not present the situation that confronts this House fairly. That radio speech of his—and I am not charging any deliberate intent to do so, but I think that the inference which the people of the country naturally get from that radio speech is that all the rules of the House, including Jefferson's Manual, should be consigned to the scrap heap.

I do not believe that there is a single Member of this House who will study the rules and study them carefully and understandingly but what will come to the conclusion that there are only a very few places in the 43 rules of the House and the 53 sections of Jefferson's Manual that should be changed in the next Congress. In the next Congress you will have the opportunity to propose amendments and a majority of the House, irrespective of party, is going to determine what each one of the rules shall be. I do not know of a single Member of the House who is not reconciled to the idea that those who want changes in the rules of the

House shall have every possible opportunity, after the election of the Speaker and before the House begins seriously to transact business, to offer amendments to any rule of the House, including the rules of Jefferson's Manual. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. RAMSEYER] has expired.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, under leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD, I submit for printing in the RECORD, first, the entire paragraph from the History of the United States from the Compromise of 1850, by J. F. Rhodes, volume 5, pages 137-138, from which I quoted two sentences in my speech, as follows:

Friday, April 14, Lincoln held his last Cabinet meeting. General Grant was present and said that he was anxious in his continual expectation of hearing from Sherman. The President replied, "I have no doubt that favorable news will soon come, for I had last night my usual dream which has preceded nearly every important event of the war. I seemed to be in a singular and indescribable vessel, but always the same, and to be moving with great rapidity toward a dark and indefinite shore." Matters of routine were disposed of and then the subject of reconstruction was taken up. After some discussion the President said, "I think it providential that this great rebellion is crushed just as Congress has adjourned, and there are none of the disturbing elements of that body to hinder and embarrass us. If we are wise and discreet, we shall reanimate the States and get their governments in successful operation, with order prevailing and the Union reestablished before Congress comes together in December. * * * I hope there will be no persecution, no bloody work after the war is over. No one need expect me to take any part in hanging or killing those men, even the worst of them. Frighten them out of the country, open the gates, let down the bars, scare them off [throwing up his hands as if scaring sheep]. Enough lives have been sacrificed. We must extinguish our resentments if we expect harmony and union. There is too much of a desire on the part of some of our very good friends to be masters, to interfere with and dictate to those States, to treat the people not as fellow citizens; there is too little respect for their rights. I do not sympathize in these feelings." He then spoke of the Louisiana government, joined in the discussion regarding the status of Virginia, and said at the close of the meeting: Reconstruction "is the great question pending, and we must now begin to act in the interest of peace." Stanton gave two accounts of this council. "At a Cabinet meeting yesterday," he wrote at half past 1 in the morning of April 15, "the President was very cheerful and hopeful; spoke very kindly of General Lee and others of the Confederacy and the establishment of government in Virginia." At 11.40 the same morning he said in a letter to Adams: "The President was more cheerful and happy than I had ever seen [him], rejoiced at the near prospect of firm and durable peace at home and abroad, manifested in marked degree the kindness and humanity of his disposition and the tender and forgiving spirit that so eminently distinguished him."

Second, the entire article from the American Farm Bureau weekly news letter headed "Extra Session Not Seen Necessary for Farmers," as follows:

EXTRA SESSION NOT SEEN NECESSARY FOR FARMERS

Farmers are not expecting an extra session to be necessary following March 4, 1931. Much of the legislation in which they are interested at Washington classifies as unfinished business, and if in the ensuing two months Congress works with that speed which may be expected of it and which it usually manifests, they will have secured the final enactment of all, or at least most, of the bills in which agriculture is interested.

Unfinished business at Washington upon which the American Farm Bureau Federation is working consists of the following projects, all of which in some form or another have been before Congress long enough to permit expeditious handling this winter without being accused of enacting legislation carelessly.

1. Regulation of grain exchanges by amending the grain futures act, as proposed in the Capper-Dickinson measure. This bill seeks to give the Secretary more power over the rules and regulations of the exchanges; to limit short selling; and to license members of exchanges. These features might well be made applicable over cotton exchanges also. This subject has been before Congress in one form or another for years and should be finished before March 4.

2. The crop insurance bill, McNary-Hope, to investigate all phases of crop insurance, having passed the Senate can easily pass the House this winter.

3. The establishment of engineering experiment stations in connection with our State land-grant institutions in a way similar to that under which the agricultural experiment stations were set up years ago, as provided in the McNary-Haugen measure, can be disposed of this winter since it has already been reported to the House.

4. More funds for agricultural extension work, both of the emergency and of the regular classifications, as contained in the

Robinson-Garber bills for emergency and the Capper-Ketcham bills for permanent funds, should be disposed of. This work needs to be planned in counties in periods of from three to five years into the future rather than from hand to mouth methods as is now too much the case. Hence the need for more funds.

5. Farm wastes and industrial outlets for farm crops being a major resolution of the last annual meeting of the A. F. B. F. We are justified in expecting the farm waste research laboratory bill of Congressman DICKINSON to be enacted into law this winter. We must find more ways of getting rid of farm crops than feeding them merely to the animal and human stomachs.

6. Elimination of the six months' maturity minimum on farm loans and limiting assessments on farm land banks by the Federal Farm Loan Board to those amounts needed only to cover expense of examination, both having passed the Senate and reported to the House, can be rushed to final passage during the winter weeks.

7. The Farm Bureau having stood for years for the establishment of grades and standards for all farm crops, and the Department of Agriculture with the support of Congress having authorized by legislation such grades and standards, altogether constitute a force which indicates that the bill of Congressman JONES to establish grades and standards for cottonseed will be enacted this winter.

8. Owing to the rapid formulation of a national forestry program, it seems logical to expect that such a measure as that by Congressman ENGLEBRIGHT, to protect more adequately our forests from fires by building forest roads and trails, will be enacted this winter.

9. The Farm Bureau's first pronouncement in favor of eliminating the so-called lame-duck session was made perhaps six years ago. That position has not been changed, so we shall continue our endeavors to have passed the Norris resolution or any other appropriate legislation which seeks to change the Constitution by setting a different date for the inauguration of the President and the convening of Congress.

10. The bill by Senator JONES, authorizing Federal aid to assist States in promoting education relative to the welfare of mothers and infants, having already been reported to the Senate, and being under privileged status on the Senate Calendar, justifies the expectation that it will be enacted into law before the short session adjourns on March 4.

11. Now that the Farm Bureau has authorized its board of directors to set up a committee truly representative of agriculture, authorized to develop and organize a corporation for the purpose of leasing and operating Muscle Shoals on a cooperative basis, the pending Muscle Shoals legislation is expected to resolve itself by compromise into such form as will permit the Farm Bureau to submit its proposal to some sort of commission set up to receive new bids. If the present situation on Capitol Hill results in disagreement, then, of course, the only alternative left is for the Farm Bureau to present its plan in a new and separate bill. It is hoped that the pending House and Senate bills can be merged so that the Farm Bureau can present its plan under the terms of the compromise measure.

12. The Hawes-Cutting bill, providing for Philippine independence after an election has been held upon that subject by the qualified electors of the island, and providing also that by gradual processes throughout a 5 or a 10 year period the political bonds which bind the islands to our Nation will be gradually removed, having been reported to the Senate from the appropriate committee, is expected to move forward this winter. In each of the last two annual meetings the Farm Bureau has stated its position to be in favor of Philippine independence, not alone for the good of the American farmers but more for the good of the Philippine people themselves.

13. The plan of eradicating or controlling predatory animals and rodents, as outlined in the 10-year program of the United States Department of Agriculture and as contained in the Norbeck-Leavitt bills, can easily be disposed of this winter.

14. Elementary education being the foundation of our entire educational plans, and local taxation having been discovered to be inadequate properly to sustain the type of elementary education needed, makes opportune the authorization by the Federal Government of an appropriation to assist the States in the maintenance of elementary schools. This project is contained in the Nye-Brand bills.

15. The name "Farm Bureau" having become nation-wide and of commercial significance, should be along with other organization names permitted to be protected as proposed in the Vestal bill which has already passed the House and can easily be passed by the Senate before the March adjournment.

16. The bill by Senator GLENN, as amended by the House Committee on Irrigation, to permit refinancing of drainage and irrigation districts under more equitable and modern conditions, having passed the Senate in one form and having been reported from the House committee in a slightly different form, under all reasonable expectations can be disposed of by the House, and through the conference committee, before final adjournment.

None of these bills will bring in the agricultural millennium as each one is more of a minor than a major legislation project. However, altogether they constitute a rather large legislative program which when enacted will be beneficial to agriculture.

Mr. CRISP. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made on the floor of the House to-day.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks I made and to include the printing of some reference that I read.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PARKS].

Mr. PARKS. Mr. Chairman, for more than an hour we have patiently listened to a very learned discussion of the rules of this House. I confess to you that in 16 years of service in legislative bodies I come here now and say that I know very little parliamentary law. But a long time ago, at the bended knee of a Christian mother I learned a law that if it were practiced here day by day would make unnecessary a discussion of the rules of this House. That was that beautiful golden rule, "Do unto others; do unto others."

I come now not in anger but in great sadness, and approach you to-day as humble as one man ever approached another. I come to talk about a matter of importance. Deeply I regret that the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAMTON], after 18 years of service, should have shown the spirit he showed to-day. After deliberation and thought he will regret what he said. It is to be regretted that the gentleman from Massachusetts, one of the leaders of this House, who stands high in the councils of his party, would have so forgotten himself as to say what he said to me.

May I come to you to talk as one man to another; as one neighbor to another? The men who sit on the Republican side of the aisle do not know what is going on in this country.

You men who sit over there have no harder hearts than the men who sit about me, but you do not know. If you gentlemen understood the facts as I know them you would want to give relief to people who are starving as quickly as I would want to give them relief. May I come to you with a breaking heart and an humble spirit and tell you that by your votes you sent 500,000 people to bed the other night without food, and yet this is a civilized country, this is a Christian Nation, this is a place where we talk about the brotherhood and fellowship of man and the love of God?

I see the distinguished gentleman from New Jersey who everybody respects and regards [Mr. FORT]. He went into my State and plucked one of its choicest flowers and carried away one who was as beautiful, as pure and sweet as a dew-drop in the heart of a June rose, yet by his speech the other day he sent 100,000 babies in Arkansas to bed without food. Not because he did not care, but it was because he did not know. That is why he did it.

Ah, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] delivered a speech here the other day and after he had finished the entire membership on that side of the aisle stood and cheered him, and by that speech he sent many of the babies of my State to hang on famished breasts and slowly die of starvation. What did he do? He said that if the House took the action which I say it should take the greatest mother in all the world would be assassinated, the Red Cross. I deny it. I will tell him that the greatest mother in all the world was the one who went into the "valley of the shadow of death" and suffered the tortures of the damned to give him and me our existence. Yet by his vote he sent thousands of people in my State to bed the other night without food.

Mr. HOLADAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKS. I yield.

Mr. HOLADAY. I would like to know what, if anything, the State government has done or is proposing to do for the relief of the citizens of Arkansas?

Mr. PARKS. I will be delighted to tell the gentleman. The House of Representatives in the State of Arkansas, which is now in session, has passed a bill to provide for a bond issue of \$15,000,000. It may pass the Senate, but they could not sell the bonds to save their lives. My God, do you think I would stand here and appeal to you for 500,000 people if we could feed them?

Mr. HOLADAY. Does the gentleman apprehend that the Senate will pass the bill?

Mr. PARKS. Probably.

Mr. HOLADAY. But the gentleman is of the opinion that the State bonds will not be marketable?

Mr. PARKS. Oh, no. Your Liberty bonds under this administration have gone down day by day. You can scarcely sell a Government bond at this time. These people are as brave and honorable and chivalrous as any that ever walked the earth. It is not their fault they are starving.

Let me show you another thing. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] came into this House in 1914, in July, after disaster had come to the city of Salem, Mass., and asked for \$200,000 for those people—probably for 50,000 people. Every man save one from my State rose and voted to go into the Public Treasury and give to his people the money which they needed to save them from distress.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts. Let me state to the gentleman that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] does not speak for the people of Massachusetts. [Applause.]

Mr. PARKS. Ah, if the people of Massachusetts could speak to-day across the hills and hollows, they would say, "We will meet you in a common brotherhood; we will do for you what you did for us." [Applause.] When disaster comes my people know neither East nor West nor South nor North. They would have contempt for me if I did not vote to relieve suffering in New York or Massachusetts as quickly as I would in Arkansas.

Oh, I want to tell the distinguished floor leader, the gentleman from Connecticut [Mr. TILSON], who has always been courteous to me, when the war drums throbbed on every hilltop and in every valley in this Nation, when the earth trembled under the marching tread of the men in the blue and the men in the gray, his father and mine donned the same uniform, wore the same color, and marched away to do their bit in the red welter of war, and they came home after the war and were just as loyal to that flag yonder as any man on this earth. Yet he, knowing the desolation and the destitution of my State and my people, made a speech that ought to waken him in the night with remorse.

Oh, men, I wish you could know the story I am telling you. Five hundred thousand noble people destitute and starving! Do you know what the Red Cross is doing? It is giving a family of five people \$10 a month. Oh, I wish I had the power to-day to send out through this land a ringing call that would arouse people. What did your President say an hour ago? "If the Red Cross will acknowledge"—this is not his exact language—"If the Red Cross will admit they can not handle the situation, I will accept your bill."

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the gentleman yield for a question? Mr. PARKS. Certainly.

Mr. SIMMONS. I was informed day before yesterday, and I understand this is general throughout various parts of the United States, that my home county of about 30,000 people, had sent 17 carloads of food and clothing into the drought-stricken areas. Is this distribution in excess of or is it included in the total allowance to each family?

Mr. PARKS. Oh, I imagine it is not included in the money.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then it is true that in addition to what the Red Cross is giving in dollars there are great quantities of food and clothing going into that area for the relief of the distressed people?

Mr. PARKS. I have not a bit of doubt of it in the world. Oh, I would hate to think that people, wherever they lived in America, would not hear this call.

Mr. SIMMONS. I understand; but what I want to know is this—

Mr. PARKS. I imagine that food is all that is included in the \$10.

Mr. SIMMONS. Then this \$10 they are getting is supplemented by what they are getting from other sources. I

want this information, and I think the House ought to have it.

Mr. PARKS. I think the gentleman is right. I think the contributions of charity are in excess of the \$10; but it fails to meet the real necessities by a great deal.

Mr. DAVIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

Mr. DAVIS. I may state that I know in sections of my State the Red Cross will not presume to aid any citizens except those who are without any resources or aid from any other source whatever, and if they can get help from other sources—landlords, relatives, or from the general public or anywhere else—the Red Cross declines to help; and when they do presume to help, when there are no other means available, they get just what the gentleman from Arkansas has said—the pitiable sum of \$10 per month for a family of five, with an allowance to others in proportion.

Mr. SIMMONS. I would really like to get accurate information about this matter.

Mr. PARKS. I am sure the gentleman does not know the conditions, and I am sure from statements that have been made on that side that you do not know what is happening.

Mr. SIMMONS. Just a minute. I would like to see if we understand the matter, because I can not reconcile the gentleman's statement with the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mr. PARKS. I do not think there is any inconsistency in the two statements.

Mr. SIMMONS. Let me finish my statement. My understanding from the gentleman's answer is that the contributions of food and clothing that are being made from all over the United States for the drought-stricken areas are in addition to the aid being given by the Red Cross in dollars, to which reference has been made. The answer of the gentleman from Tennessee would indicate that this is not so, and I think we ought to know what is the fact.

Mr. PARKS. I think the gentleman misunderstands me and misunderstands the gentleman from Tennessee. Here is the situation. We can not keep track of the contributions that are made. If you should to-day send a contribution of clothing, like I know individuals have done from this city, nobody can keep track of that, but the average family of five are not drawing in rations from the Red Cross in excess of \$10 a month, and that is the maximum.

Mr. BYRNS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKS. With pleasure.

Mr. BYRNS. It was testified before the committee the other day by Mr. Evans, a representative of the Red Cross, who has been in Arkansas for some time, that the total amount that was given by the Red Cross in the counties to which the gentleman refers is the amount stated by him. Now, this is not given in money.

Mr. PARKS. No.

Mr. BYRNS. It is given in food of a value amounting to the sum stated by the gentleman?

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

Mr. BYRNS. And that is all they get from the Red Cross?

Mr. PARKS. Yes. Now, will you gentlemen listen to this statement from the Red Cross? I wired a gentleman in one of the counties, one of the richest and most fertile counties on the face of the earth, the county of my distinguished colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. DRIVER], and received this answer from one of the representatives of the Red Cross:

Doctors advise more and greater variety of food is absolutely necessary. The farm relief seed bill is a failure with us. The livestock are starving. Our people favor the Robinson bill for \$25,000,000.

Men who were worth a fortune a year ago are to-day unable to buy the necessities for their families. Milk cows are being killed and eaten, although they are so poor that they are unfit for food. I say this with humiliation.

Here is a letter from a former law partner of mine, R. L. Searcy, a man whom I loved like David loved Jonathan or Damon loved Pythias. He writes that in a town of 1,500 people and in a splendid school to which children came in

from the country, it was discovered some of the children were hiding away at lunch time. That was because they did not have anything for their lunch. The ladies of the town immediately provided these little children with food. The pride and spirit of the children would not allow them to take food as a matter of charity. One little angel said that she did not mind going to bed without any supper as she had had a fine lunch. In business there is competition and strife; in society there is envy and jealousy, but in the realm of childhood there is sincerity and truth.

Mr. GOLDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKS. I yield.

Mr. GOLDER. Would the gentleman be in favor of a bill authorizing the Government to lend without interest a sufficient sum to the various States to be repaid by the States when they could?

Mr. PARKS. They could not pay it.

Mr. GOLDER. Could not they pay it in the next 10 years if they got the money without interest?

Mr. PARKS. Why should the State borrow the money? Here is a list since 1803 where this Congress has relieved the people when starving. My God, why are you not willing to give the starving people this amount?

Mr. GOLDER. Irrespective of my desire, do I understand that the States would not accept a loan from the Government, that loan to be repaid without interest?

Mr. DAVIS. If the gentleman from Arkansas will yield, I want to ask the gentleman from Pennsylvania why this section now sadly stricken should be expected to borrow money when time after time other sections of the country have not been required to borrow money? [Applause.]

Mr. RAYBURN. Would Congress have the power to lend this money without the legislature having an opportunity to accept it?

Mr. PARKS. No.

Mr. LANHAM. Was there any prerequisite made for the contribution we made to Russia of \$20,000,000?

Mr. PARKS. None whatever.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. If the gentleman from Arkansas will permit I should like to add further, in this connection, that when the present occupant of the White House asked for \$100,000,000 of Congress to feed the people of Belgium there was no serious objection, as I recall, to turning over public funds for the purpose of relieving suffering humanity in foreign lands and no Member of Congress on either side of this aisle, if I remember correctly, ever suggested that Belgium, Russia, or any of the other foreign governments should ever repay it. [Applause.]

Mr. PARKS. Let me read from a celebrated correspondent, Mr. Fletcher Chinault, of the Arkansas Gazette, who is in the center of this distress. He is among them. He hears the cry of the wolf of want at their very door. He says:

It can not be possible for those who live in tall cities—

That does not apply to the gentleman who sits in the Speaker's chair, the gentleman from New York, Mr. LA GUARDIA. He has a heart of gold, even if he lives in the greatest city in the land. I have no prejudice against cities. The people who live in the cities are like those who live in the towns.

When Jesus Christ walked the highways and the lanes of this earth, He never said a word about the salvation of your soul until He first said, "Feed the body." Wherever He went He said, "Feed them." The first miracle He performed was a miracle to nourish the human body. And after He had carried His cross up Calvary's Hill and paid the penalty for mankind, and when He had risen and made His appearance at the seashore, He said to the fishermen who were without food, "Cast your net on the other side," and they did; and then what was it He said when they came and asked Him what shall be done?

When Simon Peter came and talked to Him, what did He say? Did He say seek the salvation of your soul? That was not what He said. No; He said, "Lovest thou Me?" And Simon Peter said, "Lord, Thou knowest that I love Thee." "Then, feed My lambs; feed My lambs." Then Simon Peter came back. The Lord looked him in the eyes

and said, "Peter, lovest thou Me?" And he said, "Lord Thou knowest I love Thee." And He said, "Feed My sheep, feed My sheep." O men, with hearts in you, may I appeal to you as Christ appealed to Peter? They are human beings—feed my lambs.

Just one other word, and I am through. I could read you hour after hour the testimony of the starving.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

Mr. PALMER. From what source did the gentleman receive this information as to the destitute conditions in his State?

Mr. PARKS. I received it from the principal citizens whose telegrams I have put in the RECORD; and every morning in my office I receive it in every mail that comes, in heart-breaking letters from individuals who tell me about it; and I receive it from the Red Cross, and from every county in my district, and many other counties throughout the State.

Mr. PALMER. And the statements the gentleman makes are authentic?

Mr. PARKS. Absolutely; and as I stand here in this body and look my colleagues in the face I tell you on my sacred word of honor that there are 500,000 people in a horrible condition of starvation, in spite of what the Red Cross is doing.

Mr. PALMER. In face of the gentleman's statement, I think that we should take some action.

Mr. PARKS. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKS. Yes.

Mr. HUDSON. I apprehend the gentleman probably is to the best of his knowledge making as accurate a statement as he can make with reference to the conditions in his State. I do not question his statement. I simply say this: If you will take \$25,000,000 and spread it over this Nation, to every part where there is a condition equal that there is in Arkansas, how much will there be left of the \$25,000,000 for your 500,000 people?

Mr. PARKS. I would do what we did for Belgium and Russia. I think the gentleman's uneasiness is well founded.

Mr. HUDSON. I come from possibly the greatest industrial district represented on this floor. I have a city of 56,000 population that has spent already out of public sources a million dollars to relieve the conditions the gentleman describes in Arkansas. My own home city of Lansing, not so badly situated, a little larger, has spent over \$100,000, and, sir, I came back from campaigning in the territory adjacent to Arkansas, where the wheat fields showed green, where the garden showed green, where the pastures showed green, back into my home counties, where there had not been a drop of rain since June, and where every field was brown. I say to the gentleman that it is unfair to quote Scripture simply about the gentleman's situation, when that situation exists all over this country. What we need to do to-day is to use that love the gentleman speaks of, of our Blessed Lord and Saviour, to open the bowels of mercy for human-kind in this Nation, and there will be all the response that is needed.

Mr. PARKS. That is what I am trying to get you to do.

Mr. HUDSON. No; you are not, you are trying to get the Government to do it.

Mr. PARKS. And still I quote Scripture, "And so far as the sections of the country where he found it had rained and where he found it had not, the Lord said that it rains on the just and the unjust." I say to you that if your people to-day were desolate and mine had prospered for a generation, I would be standing on this floor pleading to help your people, not putting a block in the way. When time is no more, and I stand to be judged with the quick and the dead, I can look my Creator in the face and say that by no word or act of mine did I ever strike the bread from the hand of a starving child. Can you?

One more word and I am through. We went to war in 1917, and I dare say there has not been since Holy Writ was penned a more inspired document than the one that

was delivered here by the man who told this country that America had heard the call of civilization and was endeavoring to see that the torch of liberty should not fall from the hand of man. He could see little things as well as big things. May I tell the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] that when he had his disaster at Salem and when the fire came to devastate your city, you had a real man in the White House. He did not ask you to wait and see what the conditions were, but he wired the Governor of Massachusetts that he would request the Federal Government to give \$200,000 to the fire sufferers of Salem. He is the man whose memory will ever live. He was known by more men than any human being that ever lived on the face of the earth. The Arab in his tented home in the desert bowed down and asked the god that he worshipped to bless the great White Chief in the White House who was fighting the battle of the weak nations.

Yes. Yonder under his thatched roof in the islands of the sea, in the jungles, the savage bowed down at night and prayed to whatever God he worshiped and asked that the great Chieftain of the white man be given strength that the humble of the earth might receive the blessings he fought for. Men who never heard of Napoleon or Julius Caesar or Jesus Christ bowed down at night and asked their God to bless this altruistic, Christian statesman. And yet, men stand on the floor and denounce my people because they are suffering and poor.

Mr. GLOVER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PARKS. I yield.

Mr. GLOVER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. HUDSON] made the statement a while ago that in his campaign, around through Arkansas he saw wonderful green wheat fields. Would he do us the kindness to tell us where he saw them in Arkansas?

Mr. HUDSON. I wish the gentleman might hear a Member when he makes a remark. I said nothing about being in Arkansas.

Mr. GLOVER. I understood the gentleman to say he had been down there and had seen it.

Mr. HUDSON. I did not. I said adjacent to Arkansas, and I suppose, as the distinguished gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PARKS] said, the rain had fallen on the just and the unjust alike.

Mr. GLOVER. I understood the gentleman to say he saw the green wheat fields in Arkansas. I have not seen them.

Mr. PARKS. I appreciate your kindness in listening to me. I am not talking to you in idleness but in the hope, as the gentleman said over there, that somebody will understand the situation. I can give you testimony by thousands as to what is happening if you want to know.

The emblem of liberty and Christian civilization waves over the head of the Speaker of this House, the American flag. We went to war in 1917 to preserve it. We had never sent our men across the seas before. True, we had sent them across the Rio Grande in the days gone by, and they carried that emblem up the heights of Chapultepec until it waved in triumph over the land of the Montezumas. We sent them across the Gulf to strike the shackles of slavery from arms that had been bound for a century; but they had never gone across the seas until you heard the Macedonian cry in 1917. It comes to you again to-day in a smaller way from my starving people.

They told me this story, and I heard it on this floor once. It is fiction, I assume. An American doughboy lay dying on the field of battle in a foreign land far from home, and an angel came as an escort to carry his spirit across to live forever in the beautiful land of the leal. As the flag floated over him the angel said, "What strange banner is this? I have never seen it before."

And this boy as his blood stained the flowers around him said, "This is the emblem of Christian civilization. This is the emblem of human liberty. This is the flag of my country." The angel said, "Yes; that may be true. I have seen the tricolor of France, the British lion, the dragon of China, and the Russian bear go down in the red welter of war, but I never saw that banner before." The boy as he

looked at the flag with dimming eyes as his blood flowed and strength weakened said, "These beautiful stripes of red declare that on the battlefields of my country we have given the purest blood that ever flowed in the veins of man. These beautiful stripes of white proclaim the nobleness of our purpose. Those stars set in an azure field, as beautiful and bright and scintillating as the star of Bethlehem, declare and proclaim that no nation or no man can tarnish or pull them down. It is as eternal as time itself."

For the American ex-service man now in want I plead. For his people and for those for whom he fought I ask you to hear me. [Applause.]

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 20 minutes to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, we have just listened with much interest and appreciation to the fervent plea of my friend from Arkansas [Mr. PARKS]. He has forcefully told of the terrible conditions existing in the drought sections of his State. He says his constituents are in dire need of food and clothing. The condition which has brought about this suffering in our land has not come by accident, but has come largely by unusual laws and practices which have been put into effect in our American Government during the past few years. Of course the drought has brought to a head this terrible panic. The laws and regulations and general practices of the administration which have dominated our Government affairs for the last few years, in my opinion, are at least in part to blame for the present suffering in our country, therefore the Republican Party, which is now in power and has been for many years, must share in this responsibility.

Of course, these distressful conditions are not brought about overnight. They often come from continuous conditions as same as the body may weaken and perish from the inroads of a terrible disease. Unjust and inadequate laws must be to blame for a portion of existing conditions. The laws and national practices of the Republican administration have aided in making millionaires of the few and beggars of the many; yes, of the rank and file of our great American people. By protecting and fostering monopoly and special privilege you have almost wrecked the very economic existence of our country. Our country to-day, financially and industrially, is in much worse condition than many of you realize. Let us stop and take stock for just a moment.

We find, for instance, that in 1930 the finished steel output of our country was 26,600,000 tons as compared with 40,600,000 tons in 1929. We find that in 1930 the steel production of our country represented only 63.7 per cent of its producing capacity. We find that in the United States in 1929 there were made 5,358,420 automobiles, and the automobile industry is a pretty good index of the general condition of our country. We find that in 1930 there were only 3,350,306 automobiles manufactured. We find also that in 1929 the automobile industry of our country consumed 18 per cent of the steel used, 84 per cent of the rubber, 73 per cent of the plate glass, 50 per cent of the upholstery leather, 17 per cent of the hardwood, 37 per cent of the aluminum, 15 per cent of the copper, 23 per cent of the tin, 31 per cent of the lead, 5 per cent of the zinc, 26 per cent of the nickel, and 9 per cent of the cotton used in the country.

As the automobile industry of our country has decreased, so have these various other industries decreased. We find a general factory decline in the year 1930 as compared with the year 1929 of almost 37 per cent, the lowest we have had since 1921. We find that the wholesale trade of our country in 1930 suffered a 25 per cent reduction over 1929. We find that the commodity prices of almost all of the leading commodities of our country are from 10 to 18 per cent, in some cases 50 per cent, less than they were in 1929. We find that the amount of cotton consumed is something like 30 per cent less in 1930 than it was in 1929.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. As a matter of fact, everything seems to be wrong. Everything has gone down.

Mr. GREEN. Almost all of the industries of our country show an appalling decline. Exports and imports during

1930 dropped about one-third; in fact, our foreign trade has decreased to an alarming degree.

Mr. GOLDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. GOLDER. The gentleman does not mean to blame the drought conditions on the matters of which he is speaking?

Mr. GREEN. Not by any means. The drought is beyond the control of man, but other things have contributed to this condition, for instance, the cancellation by the Republican administration of foreign debts owed our Government; the refund of taxes to millionaire corporations and individuals; blatant extravagance in national administration; unnecessary and unwise expenditures of public funds, of the taxpayers' money; refusal to curb the greedy operations of the various monopolies which are flourishing even now; and numbers of other causes have contributed to the panic which now enshrouds our country.

We find to-day that there are something like 6,000,000 people unemployed in our land. Some place the number far greater than 6,000,000. We find that during 1929 there was paid to the wage earners of the United States, exclusive of those employed by the Government and on the farms, the sum of approximately \$45,000,000,000, but that during the year 1930 there was paid approximately \$35,000,000,000. When you kill the earning power of your citizens you stop their purchasing power. People can not buy unless they have the money to buy with.

My friends, it seems that our country is in an unusual condition, and we all realize that this has been brought about gradually but surely by the policies which have obtained largely during this Republican administration. We find that there has been a very sharp decrease in the amount of money paid into the Federal Treasury, largely by reason of the general industrial conditions and the income reduction of the various industries and individuals of our country.

I shall not enumerate them, but there is one thing that is of unusual interest along this line and that is that in spite of all these adversities and in spite of all the poverty which reigns throughout the land the national income of the American people in 1930 was estimated at \$75,000,000,000. We find, my friends, that in 1928 it was \$84,000,000,000; in 1929, \$83,000,000,000; and in 1930, \$75,000,000,000. We find that the savings accounts in our banks have increased with this staggering figure of \$75,000,000,000 income in 1930. It is so improperly distributed among the people that millions are unemployed and thousands are in dire poverty and hungry. We find another thing which is rather unusual, that the amount of tax paid, on the average, per capita in 1890 was \$13.88 and in 1928, the last figures which I have, it was \$77.39.

We find that the tax laws and other laws of our land have been so shaped largely by the Republican administration, which dominates the country, as to permit the wealth of our land to drift into the hands of a petty few, and that these laws have made millionaires and millionaire corporations and combines on the one hand and paupers and beggars on the other. Yes, my friends, we have been existing under Republican reign; they are drunk and dazzling with their own power; how will it last? We find that when these millionaires and millionaire corporations desire a rebate on taxes from the Federal Treasury they go to their friend Mellon, the Secretary of the Treasury, and with what results? Make your own answer. But does the same obtain with reference to the average taxpayer? Taxes, taxes, for the average taxpayer there is no end to his paying. My colleagues, I deplore such conditions. It must be remedied.

My friends, great need is in our land, poverty is stalking on all sides, hundreds of thousands of our people are to-day seeking charity. My colleague, the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. PARKS], tells us that 500,000 in his State are in need of something to eat, the Red Cross is begging throughout our land from those who have hoarded up their millions, largely through Republican protection, begging them to give money to feed the people of our land. He [Mr. PARKS] tells us that 500,000 in his small State are now in dire want.

Two or three nights ago I heard a great program over the radio, in which Will Rogers and a number of others undertook to portray the need for instant contributions to the Red Cross.

My friends, I was moved to tears when a farmer in Arkansas, speaking on this program, told of the adversity and suffering which he and his neighbors are enduring. He told how they had only a short while ago prospered and enjoyed this world's goods and comforts, but how they were now reduced to hunger. His story was pathetic and touching; yes, it would have melted the heart of stone. He concluded with these words, "We are now beggars"—with these words he choked with American pride and sobbed as a child. Two children and a mother also spoke to the great invisible audience and pictured their distressed and dependent condition. They told of those who were hungry, those who were ill but unable to pay for or obtain medical assistance; yes, my friends, here in the richest nation in the world, and in spite of all this suffering you Republicans have defeated our efforts to appropriate to buy them the dire necessities of life itself. What kind of men are you? Have you no feeling for suffering, helpless men, women, and children? Why, I read of a family of five or more surviving on, I believe, \$5 worth of food every two weeks; possibly \$10. They have only one meal a day, and the father says he often does without his in order that his starving children may have more.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman is making a good speech, and I am in sympathy with the gentleman's ideas, but will the gentleman give us some thought as to what he would do and how he would remedy this condition?

Mr. GREEN. I will come to that later. We find that in the United States to-day there are about 850,000,000 bushels of wheat; we find that in the United States to-day there are now 2,081,000,000 bushels of corn; 50,234,000 bushels of rye; 1,402,000,000 bushels of oats; 163,543,000 bushels of apples; 94,000,000 tons of hay; and this year there were 14,243,000 bales of cotton made. The yield of nearly all other staple crops are larger for 1930 than in 1929, a surplus of almost all agricultural crops, and yet our people are freezing in the cold sections of our country and hungry in almost all parts of our land. All of the corn bins and wheat bins are bursting with their heavy load of wheat and rye and corn, yet millions of our people in civilized America are to-day begging for something to eat.

My friends on the Republican side, I want to know how you can answer the starving millions of our land when there is the largest crop of all edibles raised in our land with the exception of corn and hay. How can you answer when you know that people are starving throughout the land, and yet you come in here and vote against anything to feed them out of the Federal Treasury. You can give \$20,000,000 to feed the Russians; you can give \$100,000,000 to feed the Belgians; you can give \$200,000 to feed those in Massachusetts; you can give to charity here and you can give to charity there. Yes; this \$20,000,000 was Federal aid and would have come out of the Nation's Treasury, and you know it; yet it was given to feed starving Russians. Yes; this was to feed foreigners; yet you are unwilling to feed perishing Americans. I say give the preference to Americans always; with me, America first.

Yes; you could send the then apparently Democratic Mr. Hoover to feed the starving foreigners; will you now authorize the now apparently Republican Honorable President Hoover to feed the hungry multitudes of Americans? He could then administer unto the Belgians and other peoples of foreign lands, and to-day his own land and his own people are begging for something to eat and he and his party are standing in the way of a single contribution from the Federal Treasury. Will America approve such glaring discriminations? I say not.

Mr. GOLDER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. GOLDER. Can the gentleman tell us the amount of food that has been raised in the respective States?

Mr. GREEN. No; I am sorry; but I may not be able to give it accurately off-hand.

Mr. GOLDER. I may say to the gentleman, without meaning to detract from his statement, that the income-tax reports show that in Arkansas, for which State I have the greatest sympathy, last year the income in that State was at least \$80,000,000.

Mr. GREEN. But what is it to-day? To-day they can not get food and other necessities of life. Their banks are gone. Their crops failed. They are in poverty. They are getting one meal a day. Did you not read the other day where there was a man who said he could not eat but one meal a day, because if he did his own children would perish? Did not the gentleman from Arkansas tell you that the many school children have nothing in their lunch pails? Did you not read the other day where right down here in Virginia a man who was working on the road was eating nothing but potato peelings for his noonday meal? His fellow workers slipped some bread in his pail and threw out his peelings when they learned he had nothing to eat. He expressed his regret by saying, "I am sorry you threw away my peelings, I could have eaten them and could have taken this bread to my hungry children."

How can you reconcile the splendor and luxury of our land with such dire poverty of the rank and file, who are rearing children to carry on the destinies of our country to-morrow? Have you no sympathy or feeling for these patriotic and proud citizens who are fighting a losing battle for their sole existence? How would you like to shovel dirt or rock on the road on nothing to eat but potato peelings? How can you reconcile any such forced condition of present-day Republican prosperity? [Applause.] May I remind you also that there are 13,890,000 horses in our country and 56,389,000 cattle in our country, and yet our people are starving for something to eat. There are 47,000,000 sheep in our country, and I am sure you can find people in this city who have not had a lamb chop or piece of steak in the last 60 days.

Mr. ALLGOOD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. ALLGOOD. In regard to the amount of livestock, I saw in the morning's paper where the value of livestock in the United States had increased \$1,500,000,000.

Mr. GREEN. And yet our people are hungry and can not obtain the necessities of life. We are the richest nation in all the world, and I read just the other day in the Washington Star about a young man who had come here from Texas, a young man 19 years of age, and he collapsed in a café while begging for something to eat—in Washington, in the very shadow of the dome of our Capitol—and when he was taken to the hospital and finally regained consciousness they asked him what was the trouble, and he said, "I have not had a mouthful to eat in three days." He was perishing on the streets here for want of something to eat in the richest nation in the world. How can those who are a part of the Republican administration reconcile the conditions of our country as they exist and tell our people that they are doing what they should to protect and assist them and their dependents?

PAY SOLDIERS' BONUS

Yes; I have a solution and I am glad the gentleman asked that question. The very first thing I should do, if we could get the Republicans to agree to do it, would be to pay in cash, and in full and at once, the bonus certificate to the soldiers. That would be the first thing. [Applause.] I would disseminate this money to them throughout the various sections of our country. If they could be drawn upon to defend our Nation in its time of peril, are they not now entitled to receive payment by the Government for their just services rendered at a time when their Nation was in peril? I say they are. This debt should be paid now.

If you do not want to pay them in cash I have a splendid suggestion offered by a constituent of mine, the Hon. J. M. McKinney, of Cross City, himself a worthy and gallant soldier of the World War, and it is this: That you issue to each veteran a Government bond to take up his soldier's

bonus certificate, issue bonds in the denomination of \$250 and \$500 and \$1,000 and let him turn in his certificate and receive the bond. Let the bonds bear the usual rate of Government interest. Let him sell the bond if he wants to, and if he does not he may put it in his safety box. It is good and drawing interest for the soldier.

Oh, some Republicans say the Government may not be able to sell the bonds necessary to pay in cash these bonus certificates. Can not you give the veteran a Government bond in lieu of the certificate and let him sell it if he chooses? What is there wrong about that? He is not compelled to sell if he does not want to. I prefer payment in full in cash now, but he would prefer a Government bond in preference to his present certificate.

ADDITIONAL FEDERAL BUILDINGS

As a further measure to reduce unemployment and promote the economic life of our country I have introduced H. R. 10573. I have not time to go into the details, but under the provisions of the bill there will be made an appropriation to each congressional district in the United States of half a million dollars to be used in the construction of Federal buildings for first, second, and third class post offices, using local material when possible, local contractors, local labor. Local attorneys would pass title on land to be acquired for building and local architects would also be employed. In districts where no buildings are needed, then the money would revert to the Treasury.

My Democratic colleagues will recall how we have tried in vain to get some voice in allocation of funds recently appropriated for Federal buildings. Under my bill the funds would be equally distributed to all congressional districts instead of being left in charge of two or three Republican bureaucrats.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. CANNON. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. GREEN. Instead of that I will tell you what you are doing. You are tearing down such buildings as this magnificent post-office building down here on Pennsylvania Avenue in the District. That building is worth probably millions of dollars. It would be a credit to any city in my State. And yet the Republicans are going to tear it down and build one that will look good, because some Tom, Dick, or Harry says that it does not look up to date in architecture. To me it is absolutely absurd to tear down a building like that building and destroy its value when people in this country are starving, and you know it. I can not understand how men can become drunk with their own power and go so far as to squander the taxpayers' money when we have starving people in different sections of the country, and when my district needs Federal buildings so badly.

Now I want to tell you Republicans something else with reference to this new building they are building down here for the Department of Commerce. The papers tell us they are going to spend \$82,000 in order to have the offices of these high moguls kept cool with the fresh waters from Old Timber Creek. I do not understand how men of good judgment can become so drunk with their own power that they can forget the wants of our people and squander the money of the taxpayers in such a reckless and ruthless manner and our people in want throughout the land and my people begging for post-office buildings.

Mr. SIMMONS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. I yield.

Mr. SIMMONS. I think the gentleman does not want the Record to show in his statement that at the present time the Post Office Department Building on the Avenue is being torn down. I understand that eventually under the program it will be removed.

Mr. GREEN. Oh, they are not doing it at the present moment, but it is in their plan, and will be done if we Democrats can not stop it. I understand they are going to tear down also the railroad building near it, which would be a credit to any city in the average State, because it does not look good.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN. Yes.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. The gentleman gave us one solution about paying a bonus to the veterans. He said something about the millions of bushels of wheat on hand. What would the gentleman do with the wheat to alleviate the suffering?

Mr. GREEN. I should turn over to the Federal Government, to be distributed through the Red Cross or otherwise, at least the quantity of wheat now held by the Federal Farm Board; supply it to the needy for food. Another bill that I have that could take care of my State, at least, is H. R. 16628, which provides for reimbursement of part of the losses my people suffered during the fruit-fly campaign.

Those who suffered from the campaign to eradicate the pink boll weevil and the campaign to eradicate the foot and mouth disease have been repaid, and, yet, after almost two years since the Federal Department of Agriculture went to Florida and ruthlessly and perhaps necessarily, destroyed millions of dollars worth of the property of the citizens, they have not yet received a penny for it, and plead all we may, request all we may, we have been unable to get reimbursement for them. I shall deeply appreciate it if my colleagues will cooperate with me in bringing this just relief to our Florida people. [Applause.]

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES].

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, to refer for a moment to the bill under consideration, I rise to give notice that during the consideration of the bill under the 5-minute rule I shall offer an amendment which will be in the nature of legislation and, therefore, subject to the point of order that it is legislation on an appropriation bill. However, I hope it will so appeal to the membership of the House that no point of order will be made against it. The purpose of the amendment is to continue the select committee of the House studying the fiscal relations between the District of Columbia and the Federal Government after the 4th of March. The present Congress, of course, ceases on the 4th of March, and any committee of the House of Representatives appointed by simple resolution of the House also ceases to exist at that time. The select Committee on Fiscal Relations has found that it will not be able to complete satisfactorily the work assigned to it before the adjournment of this Congress, and at a session some time ago unanimously voted to suggest that appropriate action be taken to continue the life of the committee. Accordingly, after consulting with the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS], chairman of this subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations having charge of the District appropriations bill, this course has been decided upon. The Committee on Appropriations is sensitive about putting legislation on appropriation bills. I am making this statement at the suggestion of the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS], chairman of this subcommittee, so that the House may have full notice of what is proposed to be done. I trust there will be no opposition to it. It is merely a method of continuing the select committee for a time after the adjournment of this Congress so that it may complete its work.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma. How many members of this committee are Members elect of the next Congress?

Mr. MAPES. There are seven members of the committee and all of them are Members elect of the next Congress.

Mr. Chairman, I send to the desk and ask to have read in my time the amendment which I propose to offer.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will read.

There was no objection, and the Clerk read as follows:

SELECT COMMITTEE ON FISCAL RELATIONS, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Those members of the Select Committee on Fiscal Relations, House of Representatives, appointed pursuant to House Resolution No. 285, Seventy-first Congress, who are Members elect to the Seventy-second Congress, or a majority of them, during the

period from March 4 to December 31, 1931, inclusive, are hereby authorized to continue the investigations and to have the authority and privileges provided in such House resolution. Any unobligated balance on March 4, 1931, in the allocation made to such select committee from the contingent fund of the House, under the authority of House Resolution No. 329, Seventy-first Congress, shall remain to the credit of such committee as continued hereby, to be paid out on the usual vouchers approved as now provided by law.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to add just this further word: The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SIMMONS], I am informed, told the full committee of the Committee on Appropriations that some such amendment as this would be offered to the bill under the 5-minute rule, and, as I said, I make this statement now so that the general membership of the House may be fully informed of the purpose sought to be accomplished.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I shall take a few moments for myself. A considerable discussion has been had in the House at different times regarding the matter of cashing adjusted-compensation certificates. Presentation of all sides of the matter should be had. A statement was made before the Committee on Ways and Means by General Hines of the Veterans' Administration, former Director of the Veterans' Bureau, upon that subject matter. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by including about two pages of the summary of that discussion on the part of General Hines.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD in the manner indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

General HINES. Yes; I talked about those; but we have found this, Congressman, that due to conditions we have had a greater number of applications for disability compensation filed during this year than heretofore, and many of those claims are good claims. We lay it primarily to the fact that a number of veterans undoubtedly were endeavoring to carry on and had no intention of applying to the Government for relief until they found themselves out of employment and in need and they filed, having protected their claims at a prior time by receiving from the Government a certificate of injury or disability, which they used.

Previous to this time in coming before your committee on pending legislation I have been able to offer for your consideration suggestions as to the best method, in my opinion, of meeting the need sought to be provided by the various bills introduced in the House and before you for consideration. In this instance, however, I must confess I am unable to offer any suggested legislative solution of the problem confronting you.

Four different general plans for providing additional payments under the World War adjusted compensation act have been presented to you for consideration:

1. The payment of the face value of all adjusted-service certificates.
2. The payment of the present value of all adjusted-service certificates.
3. The payment of adjusted-service credits, plus 25 per cent, plus 4 per cent interest, to the present time.
4. Increased loans.

Undoubtedly from a financial standpoint the least costly and therefore from that standpoint the best would be the fourth plan, namely, that to increase the loan values on the certificates. Likewise, this plan has the merit of not requiring the surrender of the certificates in order to secure additional funds. However, it would not be actuarially sound to increase to any great extent the present loan values on these certificates, and, in my opinion, a slight increase would be of little benefit and would only result in piddling away of an additional amount which would be charged against the face value of the certificate. The first three plans mentioned, while providing a real measure of cash relief, are, according to the Secretary of the Treasury and other financial experts, unsound from a financial and economic standpoint. Therefore, I find myself in the predicament of being unable to recommend one plan because of the inadequacy of the relief afforded and the others because of their adverse effect on the finances of the country.

It is my honest belief that a great deal of misunderstanding has arisen among veterans as to just what their certificates represent. I believe many of them are of the opinion that the face value of the certificate is the value of the certificates at this time. If it could be explained to them just what the present value represents in cash, I do not believe that there would be any serious demand for this cash payment. Further, it goes without saying that the average veteran would not advocate or favor any proposal which would disrupt, or tend to disrupt, the fiscal policies of the Government, or which would adversely affect the economic situation of the country or the public welfare.

As I see it the veterans of the country may be divided into three groups. The first group are those to whom the adjusted-service certificate is just another security in the strong box.

While undoubtedly the number of men in this group is not large, still there are a considerable number of ex-service men in such circumstances. Certainly this group of ex-service men do not need cash or assistance from the Government at this time, and there is no reason why the Government should strain its resources to pay to-day an obligation due them in 1945.

The second group, and I believe the largest group of ex-service men, are those who, while working for a living, are employed and earning enough to support themselves and their families. It is probably true that the majority of this group of ex-service men are not able to save much, if anything, and that these certificates represent not only their sole investment or savings, but their only life insurance. Further undoubtedly many of them have borrowed on their certificates. However, I will venture to say in most cases they have spent the money so obtained on other than bare necessities. While a part of this group undoubtedly could use additional amounts of cash to advantage, I believe such amounts, to a great extent, would be expended for other than necessities of life. In other words, there is no actual need for relief. Therefore the payment of any additional cash on the basis of these adjusted-service certificates, in so far as this group are concerned, can not be said to be essential, and to offer them an inducement to cash in their certificates would, in my opinion, be most unwise.

The third group of ex-service men are those, especially the ones with families, who are out of work and are now in dire need. Undoubtedly this group, which consists of a considerable number, could well use and would take any cash settlement offered to them. They have already borrowed on their certificates to the maximum and are in need of assistance at this time. But should we force them to surrender this investment, which is without question the only investment or life insurance which they have, in order to secure aid to bridge this period of economic depression. Would it not be better to help them find jobs and assist them by creating more jobs than to make them pay their own way out of their only savings through this period of distress. They are only a component part of thousands of American citizens who are in such circumstances. If we are to provide direct relief to the other citizens, why should not these ex-service men be permitted to keep their adjusted-service certificates and likewise benefit by such direct-relief measures as are provided. The American Legion and other ex-service organizations are helping these men to secure jobs. These organizations, through their welfare and other funds, are assisting in taking care of them and their families until they can secure jobs. It seems to me that this problem will be better met in this way and that the soldier will be better off by so meeting it. As I previously stated concerning this group, there can be no question of need for assistance, but is there any greater need and have they any more right to look to their Government for assistance than their equally unfortunate neighbors who were too old or too young to serve?

Also, while it seems to me the country owes a greater duty to the disabled ex-service men, whether disabled through disease or age, and to the widows and orphans of deceased ex-service men than which it owes to its other citizens, it also seems to me that it owes only the same duty to the able-bodied ex-service men and their families as it owes to every other citizen.

I realize it is contended that this is money due the ex-service men but, as I understand it, outside of the present and future loan values, no money is due on these certificates until 1945 unless the holders die prior to that date. Therefore, I can see no reason why the Government should advance the date of maturity at this time. I am firmly of the opinion that if these certificates are paid off at any value less than their face value the ex-service men of the country will feel that they have been forced to sacrifice the true amount which is due them and that after the amounts provided are paid and spent they will come back and demand that the difference between such amounts and the face value be paid to them.

There is one phase of this matter which I think merits particular attention and which, to my mind, if no other, would prevent my recommending any of the plans which would involve the surrendering of these certificates or the greater impairment of their value, and that is the benefit which is derived from these certificates when the ex-service man dies, leaving a widow and children. If the members of this committee could but see the good which is accomplished in such cases—and I might say that 75 per cent of the veterans have dependents—I am sure you would agree with me. I do not believe that I am overestimating when I say that 98 per cent of the ex-service men who died leave no other assets than the proceeds of their adjusted-service certificates. In other words, these amounts represent the only money left to help span the period between the date of death of the soldier and the date of adjustment by the widow to her new conditions in life. I should be glad if the committee would see fit to call before it those in the bureau and those in the American Legion and other ex-service organizations who are daily confronted with the problem of caring for the widows and orphans of these deceased ex-service men. I am sure they would advise the committee of the inestimable amount of benefit which flows from the proceeds of these certificates and would advise against any legislation which would take away this godsend to the widows and orphans of these ex-service men.

Mr. Chairman, I realize that in making this statement I have offered no legislative solution to this most perplexing problem of what should be done about paying the bonus, but my best advice is that the Congress should give consideration to the further extension of benefits to the disabled, to the widows and orphans of deceased ex-service men, and to the building of additional hos-

pitals and soldiers' homes to care for the sick, and leave the able-bodied ex-service men to take their places along with the other citizens of the country in working out their own salvation during these distressing times. Certainly, he has this advantage over the average citizen—that is, an excellent investment, which has a loan value and which is a protection for his family in the event of his death and for him in his old age.

In closing, gentlemen of the committee, I would invite attention to the fact that the appropriations which you approved in the House the other day for veterans' relief for the fiscal year 1932 were nearly \$900,000,000; that these expenditures will undoubtedly increase under existing law and that additional costly legislation will be needed and later enacted into law. Therefore, it seems to me we should pause and think of the possible effect the acceleration or the increasing of this enormous liability of the Government will have on future legislation for the disabled and widows and orphans. I believe we have reached a point in connection with veterans' relief when we must give serious consideration to where we are going. It would be a pity, in my judgment, to have public opinion turned against relief measures for disabled veterans because of any unwise legislation for the able-bodied.

Mr. Chairman, I desire to express to the committee my appreciation for the patience and great courtesy you have extended to me. I will be glad to furnish additional information or to answer additional questions, and am at the disposal of the committee in any steps you may decide to take. I thank you.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. LaGUARDIA, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 16738, the District of Columbia appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Mr. CAMPBELL of Pennsylvania, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that that committee had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H. R. 2936. An act to provide for a preliminary examination of the Tittabawassee and Chippewa Rivers, Mich., and San Juan River, N. Mex., with a view to the prevention and control of floods; and

H. R. 14040. An act to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to expedite work on the Federal-building program authorized by the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926, and acts amendatory thereof.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 4944. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Potomac River at or near Dahlgren, Va.;

S. 5319. An act to grant the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the French Broad River on the proposed Morristown-Newport Road between Jefferson and Cocke Counties, Tenn.; and

S. 5360. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Wednesday, February 4, 1931, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

Mr. TILSON submitted the following tentative list of committee hearings scheduled for Wednesday, February 4, 1931, as reported to the floor leader by clerks of the several committees:

COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC BUILDINGS AND GROUNDS

(10 a. m.)

To amend subsection (a) of section 1 of an act entitled "An act for the acquisition, establishment, and development

of the George Washington Memorial Parkway along the Potomac from Mount Vernon and Fort Washington to the Great Falls, and to provide for the acquisition of lands in the District of Columbia and the States of Maryland and Virginia requisite to the comprehensive park, parkway, and playground system of the National Capital," approved May 29, 1930 (H. R. 16218).

To authorize the acquisition of additional land for enlarging the Capitol Grounds (H. R. 16703).

To amend the act approved March 4, 1929, entitled "An act to provide for the enlarging of the Capitol Grounds" (H. R. 16340).

COMMITTEE ON BANKING AND CURRENCY

(10.30 a. m.)

To amend section 5216 of the Revised Statutes of the United States (H. R. 12490).

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS

(10 a. m.)

To consider bills for the immediate payment of adjusted-compensation certificates.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

812. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for the Navy Department for salaries, office of the Secretary of the Navy, for the fiscal year 1932, amounting to \$5,420, which is supplemental to the estimate of \$211,960 contained in the Budget for the fiscal year 1932 (H. Doc. No. 733); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

813. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting estimate of appropriations submitted by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, to pay claims and causes of action which have been settled by them under the provisions of the act entitled "An act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to settle claims and suits against the District of Columbia," approved February 11, 1929 (45 Stat. 1160), as amended, amounting to \$19,114.18 (H. Doc. No. 734); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. WASON: Joint Committee on the Disposition of Useless Executive Papers. A report on the disposition of useless papers in the Government Printing Office (Rept. No. 2470). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 13293. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with the school board at Frazer, Mont., in the construction of a high-school building to be available to Indian children of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2474). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. LEAVITT: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 15601. A bill to provide funds for cooperation with the school board at Poplar, Mont., in the extension of the high-school building to be available to Indian children of the Fort Peck Indian Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2475). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. EVANS of Montana: Committee on Indian Affairs. S. 873. An act to supplement the act entitled "An act for the relief of certain nations or tribes of Indians in Montana, Idaho, and Washington," approved March 13, 1924; with amendment (Rept. No. 2476). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. PEAHEY: Committee on Indian Affairs. H. R. 11281. A bill authorizing a per capita payment of \$100 to the members of the Menominee Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin from funds on deposit to their credit in the Treasury of the

United States; with amendment (Rept. No. 2477). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. REECE: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 9221. A bill authorizing the President to reappoint Maj. Harry Walter Stephenson, United States Army (retired), to the position and rank of major, Coast Artillery Corps, in the United States Army; with amendment (Rept. No. 2467). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin: Committee on Claims. H. R. 12148. A bill for the relief of Charles C. Bennett; with amendment (Rept. No. 2468). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. HILL of Alabama: Committee on Military Affairs. S. 3360. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to convey to the University of Oregon certain lands forming a part of the Coos Head Military Reservation; without amendment (Rept. No. 2469). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. DEROUEN: Committee on the Public Lands. H. R. 12560. A bill concerning the claim of Jacobs Landry; without amendment (Rept. No. 2471). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. WURZBACH: Committee on Military Affairs. H. R. 13661. A bill for the relief of George W. McDonald; with amendment (Rept. No. 2472). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. GRAHAM: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 16635. A bill authorizing the relief of the McNeill-Allman Construction Co. (Inc.), of W. E. McNeill, Lee Allman, and John Allman, stockholders of the McNeill-Allman Construction Co. (Inc.), and W. E. McNeill, dissolution agent of McNeill-Allman Construction Co., to sue in the United States Court of Claims; without amendment (Rept. No. 2473). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 16493) granting a pension to Hiram P. Marcum; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 16127) granting a pension to Philip Aaron; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. CLANCY: A bill (H. R. 16828) to extend the time in which applications may be made for the benefits of the disabled emergency officers' retirement act of May 24, 1928; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. COOPER of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 16829) granting the consent of Congress to the Board of County Commissioners of Mahoning County, Ohio, to construct a free overhead viaduct across the Mahoning River at Struthers, Mahoning County, Ohio; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. McCLINTIC of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 16830) granting pensions to certain soldiers of the Regular Establishment who served on the western frontier during the Indian wars, skirmishes, expeditions, and campaigns for opening new territory for settlements under martial law from 1817 to 1898, inclusive, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 16831) to amend section 5219 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, as amended; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 16832) to pay 50 per cent of the face value of adjusted-compensation certificates to veterans of the World War, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOGG of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 16833) to establish a term of the United States Circuit Court of Appeals at Huntington, W. Va.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LEAVITT: A bill (H. R. 16834) to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near the point known and designated as the Power-site Crossing or at or near the point known and designated as Wilder Ferry, in the State of Montana; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 16835) to amend the revenue act of 1928 relating to depletion of mines; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRIGHAM: A bill (H. R. 16836) to amend the act entitled "An act defining butter, also imposing a tax upon and regulating the manufacture, sale, importation, and exportation of oleomargarine," approved August 2, 1886, as amended; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SHOTT of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 16837) to provide for cooperation with the several States in the care, treatment, education, vocational guidance and placement, and physical rehabilitation of crippled children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, memorials were presented and referred as follows:

Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of California, memorializing the Congress of the United States to reimburse the State of California for moneys actually expended in the aid of the Government of the United States during the War between the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KERR: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of North Carolina, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass an act authorizing the immediate payment to veterans of the World War the face value of their adjusted-service compensation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, memorial of the State Legislature of the State of North Carolina, requesting the Representatives from the State of North Carolina to secure the enactment of some appropriate measure delaying foreclosure of liens by Federal land banks; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the Congress of the United States for the immediate payment in cash of the World War adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COLTON: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Utah, memorializing the Congress of the United States to pass the Jones bill, H. R. 255; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KADING: Memorial of the State Legislature of the State of Wisconsin, memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation looking toward the payment in cash of the World War adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BLACKBURN: A bill (H. R. 16838) granting a pension to Mariah Matilda Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CELLER: A bill (H. R. 16839) for the relief of Ida Becker; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CRAIL: A bill (H. R. 16840) granting a pension to Alice Mitchell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 16841) to authorize the purchase by the city of Myrtle Point, Oreg., of certain lands formerly embraced in the grant to the Oregon & California Railroad Co. and revested in the United States by the act approved June 9, 1916; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. HOGG of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 16842) granting an increase of pension to Martha Dorsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPE: A bill (H. R. 16843) granting an increase of pension to Johanna Reiter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 16844) granting a pension to George H. Miller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mrs. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 16845) granting a pension to Melissa Powers; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16846) for the relief to W. G. Tackett; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 16847) granting a pension to Margaret Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PALMER: A bill (H. R. 16848) granting a pension to Amanda Builderback; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PRITCHARD: A bill (H. R. 16849) for the relief of Harry P. Cooper; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: A bill (H. R. 16850) granting a pension to Lizzie B. Stoner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 16851) granting a pension to Myrtle B. Oldfield; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

9070. Petition of the Tri-County Florists' Association of Ohio, urging the passage of legislation for the payment of the adjusted-compensation certificates, full face value, immediately; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9071. By Mr. BOHN: Petition of members of Upper Hay Lake Grange No. 1552, that the United States Government should aid in making the electric power and water power of the Sault Ste. Marie River available to agriculture at a reasonable rate; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

9072. By Mr. CANFIELD: Resolution of W. W. Bloemer, commander, and E. H. Boese, adjutant, of Prell-Bland Post, No. 271, Batesville, Ind., urging the passage of legislation having for its purpose the payment of the adjusted-service certificates in cash; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9073. By Mr. CLARKE of New York: Petition of the members of the Good Will Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Binghamton, N. Y., urging Congress to enact a law for the Federal supervision of motion pictures, establishing higher standards before production for films that are to be licensed for interstate and international commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9074. By Mr. CULLEN: Petition of American Exporters and Importers' Association, urging that the Foreign Commerce of the United States be represented in the Cabinet by a secretary of foreign commerce, who shall devote his entire time to improving and extending the foreign trade of the United States, both export and import, and that the said secretary of foreign commerce shall have full charge of all matters pertaining to foreign trade now under the supervision of the Bureau of Foreign and Domestic Commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9075. Also, petition of New York State Bankers' Association, opposing the conferees' report on Muscle Shoals legislation, which is as follows: "Whereas the House conferees on Muscle Shoals legislation have yielded to the Senate conferees and have agreed to a compromise plan under which the Government would build transmission lines for the distribution of electric current from Muscle Shoals"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9076. By Mr. HANCOCK of New York: Petition of Rev. W. W. Hunt and other residents of Syracuse, N. Y., favoring the Sparks-Capper amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9077. By Mr. JAMES of Michigan: Petition of Veterans Political Association of America, urging legislation to pay the face value of veterans' adjusted-compensation certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9078. Also, petition of Veterans Political Association of America, national headquarters, Detroit, Mich., urging legislation that will permit of the veterans' paid-up service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9079. Also, petition of Richard M. Jopling Post, No. 44, American Legion, Michigan, favoring legislation which will permit payment of the veterans' paid-up adjusted-service certificates; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9080. By Mr. JOHNSON of Texas: Petition of E. E. Oberholtzer, superintendent of public schools, Houston, Tex.; Col. Ernest O. Thompson, mayor of Amarillo, Tex.; and H. D. Fillers, superintendent of public schools, Corsicana, Tex., comprising a committee appointed by the Illiteracy Commission of Texas, favoring a law to provide for the giving of lists of the illiterates to the State superintendents of the various States for use in illiteracy campaigns; to the Committee on Education.

9081. By Mr. McCORMACK of Massachusetts: Petition of Boston City Council, Boston, Mass., Wilfred J. Doyle, city clerk, urging early and favorable consideration of legislation providing for the immediate payment in cash of the adjusted-compensation certificates issued to United States veterans of the World War; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

9082. By Mr. O'CONNOR of New York: Resolutions of the New York State Bankers' Association, in opposition to the conferees' report on the Muscle Shoals bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

9083. By Mr. SPARKS: Petition of local Woman's Christian Temperance Union, of Portis, Kans., for the Federal supervision of motion pictures; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

9084. By Mr. WYANT: Petition of Friday Reading Club, of West Newton, Pa., urging passage of Sparks-Capper bill eliminating unnaturalized aliens for counting in proposed congressional reapportionment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

9085. Also, petition of Warren County Council of Republican Women, urging tariff on petroleum and its products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 4, 1931

(Legislative day of Monday, January 26, 1931)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate will receive a message from the House of Representatives.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

A message from the House of Representatives by Mr. Haligan, one of its clerks, announced that the House had passed bills of the following titles, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 16626. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy, etc., and certain soldiers and sailors of wars other than the Civil War, and to widows of such soldiers and sailors; and

H. R. 16744. An act granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The message also announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the following enrolled bills, and they were signed by the Vice President:

S. 4944. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Potomac River at or near Dahlgren, Va.;

S. 5319. An act to grant the consent of Congress to the Highway Department of the State of Tennessee to construct a bridge across the French Broad River on the proposed Morristown-Newport Road between Jefferson and Cocke Counties, Tenn.;

S. 5360. An act to extend the times for commencing and completing the construction of a bridge across the Missouri River at or near Randolph, Mo.;

H. R. 2936. An act to provide for a preliminary examination of the Tittabawassee and Chippewa Rivers, Mich., and San Juan River, N. Mex., with a view to the prevention and control of floods; and

H. R. 14040. An act to enable the Secretary of the Treasury to expedite work on the Federal-building program authorized by the act of Congress entitled "An act to provide for the construction of certain public buildings, and for other purposes," approved May 25, 1926, and acts amendatory thereof.

CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. FESS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Ashurst	Fess	King	Shipstead
Barkley	Fletcher	La Follette	Shortridge
Bingham	Frazier	McGill	Smith
Black	George	McKellar	Smoot
Blaine	Glass	McMaster	Steck
Blease	Glenn	McNary	Steiwer
Borah	Goff	Metcalf	Stephens
Bratton	Goldsborough	Morrison	Swanson
Brock	Gould	Morrow	Thomas, Idaho
Brookhart	Hale	Moses	Thomas, Okla.
Broussard	Harris	Norbeck	Townsend
Bulkley	Harrison	Norris	Trammell
Capper	Hatfield	Oddie	Tydings
Caraway	Hawes	Partridge	Vandenberg
Carey	Hayden	Patterson	Wagner
Connally	Hebert	Phipps	Walcott
Copeland	Heflin	Pine	Walsh, Mass.
Couzens	Howell	Pittman	Walsh, Mont.
Cutting	Johnson	Ransdell	Waterman
Davis	Jones	Reed	Watson
Deneen	Kean	Robinson, Ark.	Wheeler
Dill	Kendrick	Sheppard	Williamson

Mr. WATSON. I desire to announce that my colleague the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] is detained from the Senate by illness. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I wish to announce that my colleague the senior Senator from Delaware [Mr. HASTINGS] is unavoidably detained from the Senate. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

PERSONAL STATEMENT

Mr. CARAWAY. Mr. President, I doubt the good taste of the statement I am about to make, but I shall make it nevertheless.

The other day I made a speech discussing the drought situation; whether in good taste or bad taste I am not now discussing. Two gentlemen became very much stirred up about it. I have been endeavoring to extend to them an opportunity to tell me personally what they really think about it. They have declined to do it, Mr. President, or to afford me an opportunity to tell them privately what I think about them. I am now extending them this public invitation: At any time that is convenient for them it will be convenient for me to have them tell me privately what they want to say about that speech.

READING OF WASHINGTON'S FAREWELL ADDRESS

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair, under the order of the Senate of January 24, 1901, designates the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. BRATTON] to read Washington's Farewell Address on Monday, February 23, next.